

THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ-ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ TERMINOLOGY IN 1 CORINTHIANS.

A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE CORINTHIAN OPPONENTS
OF PAUL AND ITS RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

by

Birger Albert Pearson

It is a commonly held supposition in scholarly circles that Paul's opponents in his Corinthian congregation were "Gnostics."

One of the bases for this supposition is the occurrence of the (presumably "gnostic") ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ-ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ terminology in 1 Corinthians.

In this dissertation the origins of this terminology are investigated, and the use of this terminology in 1 Corinthians and in gnostic literature is examined.

The conceptual background of the ΠΝΕΥΜΑ-ΨΥΧΗ differentiation is the doctrine in popular Hellenistic philosophy of a mortal and immortal soul. More specifically, the immortal νοῦς is distinguished from the mortal ψυχή. This idea is taken over in Hellenistic Judaism, but under the influence of the language of Genesis 2.7 (LXX) the distinction assumes the form ΠΝΕΥΜΑ-ΨΥΧΗ. The origin of the ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ-ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ terminology, therefore, is the Hellenistic-Jewish interpretation of Genesis 2.7.

It is against the background of this Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 that the usage of the ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ-ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ terminology

amongst the Corinthian opponents of Paul is to be understood.

In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul is arguing against a doctrine of immortality based on the Hellenistic-Jewish interpretation of Genesis 2.7. This accounts for their denial of the resurrection of the dead. Paul counters his opponents' arguments by utilizing their terminology, but re-interpreting it to affirm his doctrine of the resurrection. His own eschatological "targum" of Genesis 2.7 is understood against a Pharisaic-apocalyptic exegesis of Genesis 2.7 which affirms a new creation (resurrection) of man in the Age to Come. For Paul Christ, the "second Adam," is the first-fruits of the general resurrection, and man in Christ looks forward in hope to this future achievement of immortality.

In 1 Corinthians 2 the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology occurs in the context of a claim on the part of the Corinthian opponents to a spiritual "wisdom." Their achievements in "wisdom" were a sign that they were living on a higher plane of existence, one that differentiated them as πνευματικοί and τέλειοι from the ψυχικοί or νήπιοι. The τέλειος-νήπιος contrast is understood against a Hellenistic-Jewish background and the use of this terminology by Philo. The πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology in this "wisdom" context is based on an aspect of the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 which teaches that man has the "spiritual" capacity within himself to achieve by wisdom the higher, heavenly

plane of existence. Paul counters his opponents' arguments by taking over his opponents' terminology and re-interpreting it in categories derived from Jewish apocalyptic and primitive-Christian eschatology.

It is noted that the term γνῶσις does not occur in the context of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology, nor can γνῶσις be equated with the opponents' version of σοφία. The term γνῶσις is best understood from a study of 1 Corinthians 8, where it is clear that the term denotes insight into the realities of Christian existence here and now, along with its practical consequences. Its basis is the knowledge of the One God and the Christian confession of Christ as Lord (8.6). Paul in 1 Corinthians 8 combats the assumption of his opponents that all in the congregation have enough γνῶσις to eat meat sacrificed to idols without spiritual harm. Paul counters this with his own doctrine of love, a love which sacrifices principle for the sake of the "weak." The term in 1 Corinthians 8 is not a gnostic technical term; and Paul's opponents in Corinth were not, in fact, "Gnostics."

In a chapter on "spiritual gifts" (1 Cor. 12-14), the Hellenistic-Jewish background of the opponents' understanding of "prophecy" is set forth. In addition, W. Schmithals' interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 is examined and refuted.

A lengthy chapter is devoted to a study of the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 in gnostic literature. Genesis 2.7 is a key text in the development of gnostic mythology, and is interpreted in many different ways, with many different terminologies. The πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology does not always occur in gnostic texts, but when it does it occurs in a context of Genesis 2.7 exegesis.

It is concluded that there is both a continuity and a discontinuity between Paul's Corinthian opponents and the various gnostic groups known to us. The continuity consists in the use of a common terminology, based on a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 which distinguishes the heavenly πνεῦμα from the earthly ψυχή. The discontinuity consists in the fact that the Gnostics, contrary to Paul's Corinthian opponents, separated the πνευματικός nature of man from the realm of God's activity as Creator, and posited man's ψυχικός nature as the product of a fallen being working against, or in ignorance of, the highest Deity.

This dissertation thus contributes to a more precise understanding of the nature and origins of Gnosticism. The essence of Gnosticism is not to be seen in the various terminologies or religious-historical motifs employed, but in the re-interpretation of older categories to express something new and different. It is a "new hermeneutic" whose essence is revolt. Since the materials and building-blocks of

gnostic mythology are originally Jewish, it is concluded that

Gnosticism is a revolt against Judaism and the Jewish God.

THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ-ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ TERMINOLOGY IN 1 CORINTHIANS.

A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE CORINTHIAN OPPONENTS
OF PAUL AND ITS RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

A thesis presented

by

Birger Albert Pearson

to

The Committee on Higher Degrees in the Study of Religion

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

New Testament and Christian Origins

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

April, 1968

Copyright reserved by the author

MATRI MEAE
IN PIAM MEMORIAE
UXORIQUE FIDELI
CUM CARITATE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. ON THE TERM ΨYXIKOΣ	16
III. IMMORTALITY AND RESURRECTION IN 1 CORINTHIANS 15	38
IV. WISDOM AND THE ΠNEYMATIKOΣ IN 1 CORINTHIANS 2	71
V. ON SPIRITUAL GIFTS IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12-14	122
VI. GENESIS 2.7 IN GNOTIC EXEGESIS	141
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RAMIFICATIONS	227
BIBLIOGRAPHY	238

ABBREVIATIONS

Journals, Series, Reference Works, etc.

BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Billerbeck	Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck. <u>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</u>
<u>BZ</u>	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift</u>
<u>BZNW</u>	Beihefte zur <u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
Crum	W. E. Crum. <u>A Coptic Dictionary</u>
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Begr. v. H. Lietzmann
<u>IEJ</u>	<u>Israel Exploration Journal</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>

<u>JHS</u>	<u>The Journal of Hellenic Studies</u>
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott. <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u> . Revised edition by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, 1940
Meyer	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begr. v. H. A. W. Meyer
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
<u>NTT</u>	<u>Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift</u>
<u>PGL</u>	G. W. H. Lampe. <u>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</u>
<u>PGM</u>	K. Preisendanz. <u>Papyri Graecae Magicae</u>
<u>RevQum</u>	<u>Revue de Qumran</u>
<u>RGG</u>	<u>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</u> (3 Aufl. 1957 ff.)
RSV	The Revised Standard Version
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<u>SPCIC</u>	<u>Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus</u> , 1961.
<u>STK</u>	<u>Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift</u>
<u>StTh</u>	<u>Studia Theologica</u>
<u>SVF</u>	H. von Arnim. <u>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</u>
<u>TDNT</u>	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u> . Trans. G. W. Bromiley, of <u>TWBNT</u>
ThF	Theologische Forschung. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre
<u>ThLZ</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>

<u>ThPh</u>	<u>Theologie und Philosophie</u>
<u>ThZ</u>	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<u>TWBNT</u>	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.</u> Begr. v. G. Kittel
<u>VF</u>	<u>Verkündigung und Forschung</u>
<u>VigChr</u>	<u>Vigiliae Christianae</u>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissen-</u> <u>schaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</u>
<u>ZRGG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistes-geschichte</u>
<u>ZTK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>

THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ-ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ TERMINOLOGY IN 1 CORINTHIANS.

A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE CORINTHIAN OPPONENTS

OF PAUL AND ITS RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Ever since W. Lütgert in 1908 proposed the theory that the opponents of Paul in his Corinthian congregation were Gnostics,¹ there has been no lack of scholarly argument to support that contention.² Indeed, it has become almost standard now to refer to the opponents of Paul in Corinth as "Gnostics." So, for example, E. Dinkler in his article in RGK on "Korintherbriefe" says that Paul was polemicizing in his Corinthian letters against a single front of opponents, "gegen christliche Pneumatiker . . . ;

1. Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth (BFCT 12.3, Gütersloh, 1908).

2. For a brief, but useful, summary of the history of scholarship on the Corinthian opponents of Paul, see D. Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (WMANT 11, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964), pp. 7-16.

diese sind Gnostiker . . . wahrscheinlich judenchristliche Gnostiker."¹ Again, W. Kümmel in the standard isagogic work on the New Testament, "Feine-Behm-Kümmel," maintains that Paul in 1 Corinthians is arguing against "a new Gnostic interpretation which ascribed complete salvation and unconditional moral freedom to the 'pneumatikos,' as one who had been freed from the σάρξ ."² And in 2 Corinthians, according to Kümmel, Paul is faced with "a definite Gnostic, Palestinian, Jewish-Christian opposition created by new additional opponents"³

One very important aspect of the argument has been the issue of "gnostic terminology."⁴ And by far the most important set of terms involved in the argument is the

1. RGG³, IV, 18, citing in parentheses Lütgert, Reitzenstein, Bultmann, and Schmithals.

2. P. Feine, J. Behm, W. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. Mattill, Jr. (Nashville, 1966), p. 202.

3. Ibid., p. 209.

4. This was not the main concern of Lütgert's work. He had proposed his theory on the basis of a study of the "Christ party" in Corinth (2 Cor. 10.7; cf. 1 Cor. 1.12), and understood the debate between Paul and his opponents to have centered on Christological differences (see 2 Cor. 11.4, and Freiheitspredigt, pp. 52 ff.) as well as basic differences in self-understanding between Paul and his parishioners (see especially Freiheitspredigt, pp. 68 ff.).

πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology, the allegedly "gnostic" differentiation between the πνεῦμα of man and his ψυχή, and between the πνευματικός man and the ψυχικός.¹

The issue of "gnostic terminology" has played a decisive role in the two recent full-scale monographs by W. Schmithals² and U. Wilckens,³ both of which have as their main thesis that the opponents of Paul in Corinth were Gnostics. One may ask whether these two books suffer from an over-emphasis on the use of certain allegedly "gnostic" terms, and frequently fall into the trap of reading into a passage from the Corinthian letters a whole theological system or philosophical Weltanschauung just on the basis of the occurrence of certain terms--not the least of which are the terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός.⁴ I shall

1. Cf. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel (New York, 1951), I, 165 ff., 174, 181 (where the phrase "the Gnostic terminology" expressly occurs), and 204. Cf. also H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist³ (Göttingen, 1964), I, 210-14; and R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen³ (Stuttgart, 1927; r. p. Darmstadt, 1956), pp. 340 ff.

2. Die Gnosis in Korinth² (FRLANT 66, Göttingen, 1965).

3. Weisheit und Torheit (BHT 26, Tübingen, 1959).

4. Schmithals prefers to view the essential anthropological contrast in terms of πνευματικός - σαρκικός, rather than πνευματικός - ψυχικός. See below, p.115.

be taking up their arguments in detail in the appropriate places in the following chapters.

It should parenthetically be remarked here that D. Georgi has recently argued that Paul in 2 Corinthians was facing a different front of opponents from those reflected in 1 Corinthians.¹ He does not regard the opponents of 2 Corinthians as "Gnostics," but rather as Hellenistic-Jewish-Christian missionaries. I have found no reason to disagree with the major thrust of his arguments, and this will be one additional factor² in limiting my own study to 1 Corinthians.³

Whenever one encounters an argument to the effect that such-and-such a terminology is "gnostic," certain inevitable questions present themselves: What is there about this terminology that makes it "gnostic"? Is there a terminology that can be considered to be "gnostic" in

1. Op. cit. See also J. M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), The Bible in Modern Scholarship (Nashville, 1965), pp. 141 ff.

2. See below, p. 12

3. I might add that Schmithals' arguments are based more upon 2 Corinthians than upon 1 Corinthians. I find Georgi's views on 2 Corinthians more convincing.

itself? Or, where did the Gnostics get a given terminology, and how did they use it?

In this dissertation I undertake a study of the use of the terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός (and χοϊκός) in order to determine (1) the original context of this terminology, (2) how this terminology functions in the theology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul, (3) how Paul himself uses this terminology in his argumentation against his opponents, and (4) how the same terminology and its context functions in gnostic literature. In the process I think something more can be learned about the nature of the theology against which Paul polemicizes in 1 Corinthians, and about Paul's own theological milieu and how this milieu governs his own use of language. And perhaps something can be learned also about the nature of "Gnosticism."

On 'Gnosis' and 'Gnosticism'

The use of the adjective "gnostic" and the noun "Gnosticism" is not particularly helpful unless it is made clear what the definition of "Gnosticism" is. Indeed, this is one of the principal tasks of the present generation of

scholarship.¹ Fortunately, this task has been made more promising (though perhaps also a little more complex) by the well-known discovery of a library of original gnostic documents near the site of the ancient city of Chenoboskion.² As more of these texts are published, more and more light can be expected to be shed on the problem of the origins and nature of Gnosticism.

It is becoming increasingly evident, however, that a proper definition of "Gnosticism" must go beyond the issues of "terminology" and history-of-religions motifs. Indeed, it can legitimately be asked whether there really is any such thing as a "gnostic terminology," as seems to be assumed particularly by Schmithals and Wilckens in their respective studies. For the creative genius of Gnosticism

1. H. Koester, "Paul and Hellenism," in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, p. 190.

2. The most important town near the site of the find is the modern Nag 'Hammadi; hence the documents are frequently referred to under this name. On the discovery and the documents uncovered see W. C. van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings (SBT 30, London, 1960), and J. Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, trans. P. Mairé (New York, 1960). For a complete bibliography up to 1963, see S. Giversen, "Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1963," StTh 17 (1963), 139-187. For a recent survey of the scholarship see R. Haardt, "Zwanzig Jahre Erforschung der koptisch-gnostischen Schriften von Nag Hammadi," ThPh 42 (1967), 390-401.

does not consist in the invention of new terminologies or new history-of-religions categories or motifs. It can be shown that every history-of-religions motif which occurs in gnostic texts has been taken over from prior non-gnostic sources and has been re-interpreted. It is this interpretation of traditional terms, motifs, myths, etc. in which that which is typically gnostic can be discovered. Gnosticism must not, therefore, be understood primarily as a syncretistic collection of history-of-religions motifs,¹ nor can it be said that Gnosticism is everywhere expressed in a certain predictable terminology. With considerable perspicacity, E. Haenchen has remarked, "Der gnostische Mythos hat für seine Seele keinen eigenen Leib gefunden."² For Gnosticism must be viewed primarily on the basis of intentionality, its way of viewing the world and the self, and the way in which the intentionality manifests itself in the various texts and systems as a hermeneutical principle.

1. Cf. D. Georgi's review of Schmithals' Die Gnosis in Korinth in Verkündigung und Forschung, Bericht 1958/59, pp. 90-96. Cf. also H. Hegermann's methodological remarks in his study of the hymn in Col. 1, Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum (TU 82, Berlin, 1961), pp. 2-5.

2. In "Das Buch Baruch," ZTK 50 (1953), 131.

This methodology and its importance for a proper definition of "Gnosticism" is coming more and more to the fore, as is illustrated by the important international colloquium on the origins of Gnosticism held in Messina, Italy, in April, 1966.¹ One of the more important papers at that colloquium was read by Hans Jonas, "Delimitation of the Gnostic Phenomenon--Typological and Historical."² In this paper, Jonas summarizes in a brilliant manner the phenomenon of Gnosticism and its mythology, subsequently remarking as follows:

Against this immoderate emotionalism, we must observe the non-naivete of gnostic myth: with all its crudities it is a work of sophistication, consciously constructed to convey a message, even to present an argument, and deliberately made up

1. For reports on the colloquy see U. Bianchi, "Le Colloque international sur les origines du gnosticisme (Messine, Avril 1966)," Numen 13 (1966), 151-160; and G. McRae, "Gnosis in Messina," CBQ 28 (1966), 322-333. The papers read at the colloquy have now been published as volume 12 in the series "Studies in the History of Religions" (Supplements to Numen), under the title, Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, ed. U. Bianchi (Leiden, 1967).

2. His paper was available to me in mimeographed form, privately circulated. The quotation is from pp. 100 f. in the published volume. Since the volume became available to me only a few days before this dissertation was submitted, I did not have opportunity to consult the other papers published therein.

of the pirated elements of earlier myth. It is, in short, secondary and derivative mythology, its artificiality somehow belonging to its character. . . . But then again, there is great ingenuity in adapting the borrowed detail to the grand gnostic design which in all the extravagance of embroidery is never lost sight of. All this is possible only in a historically 'late,' distinctly literate, and thoroughly syncretistic situation, which thus belongs to the phenomenology of gnosticism, over and above its doxography. This situation includes the free-floating availability of traditions that are no longer binding, but pregnant with redefinable meaning.

What Jonas says above about "pirated elements of earlier myth" and borrowed "traditions" applies equally well, in many cases, to "terminology." That this is so as regards the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology reflected in 1 Corinthians and in Gnosticism I shall attempt to demonstrate.

Finally, my own presuppositions on the definition of "Gnosticism" should here be made clear. I have in this dissertation accepted the definitions formulated in a tentative way by the savants at Messina. They made a distinction between gnosis and "Gnosticism," defining the former as "knowledge of the divine mysteries reserved for an élite."¹ "Gnosticism" (and "not every gnosis is Gnosticism")² was seen to involve

1. Bianchi, op. cit., p. 156. Thus one can legitimately speak of a "gnosis in Corinth" which, however, was called "wisdom"--σοφία. See below, p. 77. And on γνῶσις, see pp 117 ff.

2. Ibid., p. 157.

a coherent series of characteristics that can be summarized in the idea of a divine spark in man, deriving from the divine realm, fallen into this world of fate, birth and death, and needing to be awakened by the divine counterpart of the self in order to be finally reintegrated. Compared with other conceptions of a 'devolution' of the divine, this idea is based ontologically on the conception of a downward movement of the divine whose periphery (often called Sophia or Ennoia) had to submit to the fate of entering into a crisis and producing--even if only indirectly--this world, upon which it cannot turn its back, since it is necessary for it to recover the pneuma--a dualistic conception on a monistic background, expressed in a double movement of devolution and reintegration.¹

Further, it was specified at Messina that the type of gnosis involved in Gnosticism is conditioned by the various factors delineated above. Only that gnosis is Gnosticism

which involves in this perspective the idea of the divine consubstantiality of the spark that is in need of being awakened and reintegrated. This gnosis of Gnosticism involves the divine identity of the knower (the Gnostic), the known (the divine substance of one's transcendent self), and the means by which one knows (gnosis as an implicit divine faculty is to be awakened and actualized. This gnosis is a revelation-tradition of a different type from the Biblical and Islamic revelation-tradition).²

1. Bianchi, op. cit. One can detect here the influence of Hans Jonas. See his paper cited above.

2. Ibid. Cf. also the very succinct remarks by Hans Jonas in his "Response to G. Quispel's 'Gnosticism and the New Testament'" (in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, p. 293):

It should further be remarked that my use of the adjective "gnostic" will be governed by my presuppositions concerning the definition of "Gnosticism." I shall also, for the sake of clarity, try not to use the more general designation, gnosis, except where the context makes it absolutely clear what is meant.

The Bounds of This Dissertation

An investigation of the πνευματικός - ψυχικός (-χοϊκός) terminology in Paul must be limited to 1 Corinthians. The use of the word ψυχικός in Paul is confined to 1 Corinthians.¹ The word χοϊκός is found in the New Testament only in 1 Corinthians 15.47-49.² The word

"A Gnosticism without a fallen god, without benighted creator and sinister creation, without alien soul, cosmic captivity and acosmic salvation, without the self-redeeming of the Deity--in short: a Gnosis without divine tragedy will not meet specifications."

1. 1 Cor. 2.14; 15.44,46. It is applied to σοφία in James 3.15 and used of men in Jude 19. On these two passages see below, pp. 32ff. .

2. The use of the word σαρκικός as an anthropological category, i. e. applied to men, is also confined to 1 Corinthians: 1 Cor. 3.3. σάρκινος is used in 3.1, clearly as a synonym of σαρκικός. Cf. also Rom. 7.14. On 1 Cor. 3.3, see below, p. 115.

πνευματικός is used as an anthropological category mainly in 1 Corinthians (but also in Galatians 6.1).¹

The fact that this terminology is limited to 1 Corinthians is important, for it gives us a clue as to the situation in which the terminology arises, i. e., in the context of a discussion between Paul and his opponents in Corinth.

The occurrence of the term πνευματικοί in Galatians probably belongs to the same temporal context in Paul's missionary activity, in that 1 Corinthians and Galatians were probably written at about the same time.² The occurrence of the term πνευματικός in Galatians does show that the term was not uncongenial to Paul, and that he could make use of the term by applying to its use his own criterion as to what it means to be πνευματικός.³ According

1. 1 Cor. 2.13,15; 3.1; 14.37. Cf. also σῶμα πνευματικόν in 1 Cor. 15.44,46. τῶν πνευματικῶν in 1 Cor. 12.1 I take to be a neuter and not a masculine, as τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1; 9.11; and 2.13. See below, p. 138.

2. From Ephesus in the year 53 A. D. See D. Georgi, Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem (ThF 38, Hamburg, 1965), p. 95. I find Georgi's treatment of Pauline chronology as convincing as any, and subscribe to it here. For another point of contact between 1 Cor. and Gal., see ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος in Gal. 6.1 and 1 Cor. 4.21.

3. I can find no evidence in Galatians of the use of the term πνευματικός playing any role in Paul's controversy

to the context of Galatians 5.16 - 6.10, οἱ πνευματικοί in Galatians 6.1 are those who "walk by the Spirit" and do not "fulfill the desire of the flesh" (5.16).¹ They are "led by the Spirit" (5.18), and produce the "fruit of the Spirit" (5.22) in their lives. Therefore they belong to Christ Jesus, having crucified the flesh with its passions and desires (5.24). They "sow to the Spirit" (6.8) by bearing one another's burdens (6.2) and by unwearied well-doing (6.9). They can therefore look forward to reaping from the Spirit eternal life (6.8). In short, it is clear that for Paul οἱ πνευματικοί are those who are ἐν Χριστῷ (his more usual expression), and who have received the eschatological gift of his Spirit.

With these remarks on the use of πνευματικός in Galatians, it seems justifiable to limit our study of the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology in Paul to 1 Corinthians, and to conclude that we are correct in assuming that this terminology arises out of a polemical context in Corinth.

with his Galatian opponents. But for a contrary view, see W. Schmithals, Paulus und die Gnostiker (ThF 35, Hamburg, 1965), pp. 32 ff.

1. By analogy, the τελούντες ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός could be regarded as οἱ σαρκικοί, though this term does not occur in Galatians.

Our investigation assumes the following outline:

In Chapter Two something will be said of the conceptual background in the Hellenistic world of the use of the term $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in the contrast $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ - $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$. A number of texts in which the term $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ occurs will be examined as well. Chapter Three is an exegetical study of the relevant verses of 1 Corinthians 15, in which we examine in detail the original context out of which the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ - $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ terminology develops, namely a Hellenistic-Jewish tradition of exegesis of Genesis 2.7, and show how this context illumines the situation in Paul's Corinthian congregation. In Chapter Four this study is continued in the context of an exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 2 and the "Wisdom" theology of the Corinthian opponents. In Chapter Five the use of the term $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in 1 Corinthians 12 - 14 is discussed. In Chapter Six there is set forth in detail the variegated manner in which Genesis 2.7 functions in gnostic exegetical tradition. Finally, a short chapter of conclusions sums up the argument.

Throughout the dissertation all English translations of texts are my own, except where explicitly stated otherwise.

Chapter II

ON THE TERM ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ

Introduction

The term ψυχικός as it occurs in 1 Corinthians 2 and 15 has been a notoriously difficult one to interpret. It is, of course, not enough merely to observe that it is an adjective derived from the noun ψυχή; what must be discovered is how and why the ψυχή comes to be contrasted with πνεῦμα, and how the ψυχικός aspect of man is viewed in contrast to the πνευματικός. In other words we are after the origins of the technical usage of the term ψυχικός as it is used in connection with the correlative term πνευματικός.

This must be made clear at once because the adjective ψυχικός occurs in Greek texts as early as the pre-Socratic philosophers, though not in a way which can shed light on the origins of the "technical" usage described

above. For example, Democritus speaks of a θερμότης ψυχική,¹ and Anaxagoras says, of sleep, σωματικὸν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ πάθος, οὐ ψυχικόν.² Indeed the adjective πνευματικός is also used in Greek literature in a sense that bears little or no relation to the meaning it carries in the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology we are here investigating.³

So it is our task in this chapter to seek out a conceptual background out of which the πνεῦμα-ψυχή contrast develops, and so to uncover the origins of the technical usage of the adjective ψυχικός.

U. Wilckens on Ψυχικός

To his discussion of 1 Corinthians 2.10-16, Ulrich Wilckens⁴ appends an excursus entitled "Der Begriff ψυχικός,"

1. H. Diels and W. Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker⁷, II, 137, line 2.

2. Diels and Kranz, II, 30, 11.

3. The lexicon supplies several different meanings of the word πνευματικός, including "causing flatulence," LSJ, p. 1424. A glance at the index to SVF will show how frequently the adjective πνευματικός occurs in Stoic texts.

4. Curiously, the term ψυχικός is not discussed by Schmithals. He mentions the term ψυχικός once, in his discussion of 1 Cor. 15, but there he is satisfied with equating the term with σαρκικός. See Gnosis, p. 159.

in which he makes the following remarks:

Vor allem ist der Begriff $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ ein gnostischer Term. techn. für den Nichtpneumatiker. Wir sahen, wie in CH 1 der Aufstieg des Gnostikers so vor sich geht, dass er in den sieben Zonen jeweils eigene, welthafte Qualitäten abzulegen hat, bis er $\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omega\theta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ in den Bereich des rein Pneumatischen eintreten kann. Was hier abgestreift werden muss, ist nicht nur das rein somatisch Materielle, sondern damit zugleich auch die 'Seele'. Erlösung als Wiedergeburt zum Pneumatiker bedeutet für die Gnosis Befreiung von der $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, d.h. Abstreifen der 'psychischen' Umklammerung, Vermischung bzw. Depotenzierung des Pneuma, das in die untere Welt abgefallen ist; der gefallene Pneumatiker, von seinem Ursprung isoliert und dem Machtbereich des Nichtpneumatischen ausgeliefert, heisst $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$.¹

In referring us to the Corpus Hermeticum and its doctrine of the ascent of the self through the seven spheres, an unnecessary unclarity is introduced. For, in point of fact, nothing at all is said of the deliverance of a "pneumatic" self from the shackles of the "soul" in the Corpus Hermeticum. The word $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ does not occur in the Poimandres; neither does the word $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$.²

1. Weisheit, p. 89, where he is discussing the use of the term $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in 1 Cor. 2.14.

2. Cf. however the reference in the Kore Kosmou (Corpus Hermeticum [hereafter cited as CH], Stobaeon Extract 23.20, Nock-Festugière, ed., IV, 7) to $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\iota\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, mentioned in connection with a description of the establishment of the Zodiac. The use of the adjective $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ here has no relation to the terminology we are investigating. What is involved in this passage of the

The word ψυχή does occur, but not in the sense which Wilckens ascribes to it. In Corpus Hermeticum 1.17 we are told that the Man--referring to the one created initially by Nous which bore the εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς¹--became soul and mind from life and light, ἐκ μὲν ζωῆς ψυχὴν, ἐκ δὲ φωτὸς νοῦν. Salvation, in the Poimandres, consists in learning of one's essential origin from light and life:

φῶς καὶ ζωὴ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ
ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος. εἰς οὗν μάθης αὐτὸν
ἐκ ζωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ὄντα, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τούτων
τυγχάνεις, εἰς ζωὴν πάλιν χωρήσεις.²

This salvation comes, according to the Poimandres, only to the ἐννοῦς ἄνθρωπος.³

Thus it appears that the meaning attached to ψυχή in Corpus Hermeticum 1 is something different from what Wilckens implies in the statement quoted above. The ascent to which Wilckens refers is not described in terms of a stripping-off of the "soul" at all. It involves a

Kore Kosmou is the Platonic view of soul as that which produces motion. See e. g. Timaeus 34B and especially Laws X 896A.

1. CH, 1.12, an allusion to Gen. 1.27.

2. CH, 1.21.

3. Ibid. Cf. below, p.25, on νοῦν ἔχειν in Plutarch, de genio Socratis 591F.

dissolution of the body (ἀνάλυσις τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ὑλικοῦ) and an ascent through the spheres during which all of the bodily senses, energies, and vices are yielded up.

When Wilckens tells us that "Erlösung als Wiedergeburt zum Pneumatiker bedeutet für die Gnosis Befreiung von der ψυχή," he refers us to a footnote in which we are informed that "der ganze Traktat CH XIII beschreibt denselben Vorgang als ἀναγέννησις."¹ But this reference does not appear to be relevant, for no use is made in this tractate of the term ψυχή; the dualism in this tract is throughout a dualism of σῶμα and νοῦς. Nor does the notion of ἀναγέννησις or παλιγγενεσία provide us with any help in interpreting the term ψυχικός in 1 Corinthians, for the idea of rebirth is absent not only from 1 Corinthians, but also from all of the genuine Pauline epistles.²

Moving from the Hermetic literature, Wilckens proceeds to illuminate the meaning of the term ψυχικός from the Valentinian material, concluding that "Wir stehen hier in unmittelbarer Nähe zu 1 Kor. 2."³ The Valentinian

1. Weisheit, p. 89, n. 2. The tractate actually uses the term παλιγγενεσία and not ἀναγέννησις.

2. But cf. Titus 3.5.

3. Weisheit, p. 90.

texts which Wilckens adduces do, of course, maintain a distinction between the πνευματική and the ψυχική ουσία, stating further that all of the "psychics" are ὑποούσιοι αὐτῷ (i.e. τῷ δημιουργῷ), in contrast to the "pneumatics" who are ὑποούσιοι αὐτῇ (i.e. τῇ Σοφίᾳ). This, indeed, is one of the bases upon which the Valentinians make their distinction between "pneumatics" and "psychics." But there is no evidence that the opponents in Corinth distinguished between the higher God and the Demiurge, nor is there any evidence in 1 Corinthians for a Sophia who functions as a "redeemed-redeemer." Indeed, if the redemptive function of "wisdom" be granted for the doctrines of the Corinthian opponents--which seems probable¹--there is still no evidence in 1 Corinthians that Sophia is a fallen creature, whose very fall is responsible for the genesis of the psychic (including the Demiurge) and hylic levels of existence, and who herself needs a "Redeemer."²

It is therefore not enough merely to say that the word ψυχικός is in itself "ein gnostischer Terminus

1. On 1 Cor. 2.6 ff., see Chapter Four.

2. Actually, in the Valentinian system Christ is always the redeemer, not Sophia.

technicus."¹ It is a "gnostic" term when it is used in a gnostic context and with a gnostic intentionality. Insofar as the soul of man is regarded as a creation of an evil demiurge or of evil creator-angels, it will be regarded as bad or inferior, and the adjective ψυχικός will also share in the same connotation of the noun ψυχή.² But such a use of the terms ψυχή and ψυχικός is not evident in 1 Corinthians. It is not justifiable to argue that since the term ψυχικός occurs in gnostic texts it is therefore a gnostic term, and that therefore it is used in a "gnostic" way in 1 Corinthians. Nor is it satisfactory to account for the derivation of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology just by arguing its "gnostic" character.

ψυχικός in the LXX

The term ψυχικός occurs in the LXX only in 4 Maccabees 1.32. It occurs here in a connotation

1. Weisheit, p. 89.

2. As it does in numerous texts, usually in connection with a gnostic exegesis of Gen. 2.7. On this see Chapter Six.

somewhat different from that found in the New Testament, but ultimately, I believe, related:

Moderation is indeed mastery of one's desires. Some of these desires are of the soul (ψυχικαί);¹ some are bodily (σωματικαί); over both reason (ὁ λογισμός) is clearly the master.²

This statement is to be understood in the context of popular Hellenistic philosophy. Sophrosyne, one of the cardinal virtues in Hellenistic Greek ethics, is regarded as acting as a controlling factor against all inordinate desires, both those pertaining to the body and those pertaining to the soul. That any such "desires" are attributed to the soul at all presupposes another popular idea; namely, the division of the soul into a higher and a lower portion. The higher portion of the soul is usually denoted as the νοῦς, or the sovereign (ἡγεμονικόν) portion of the soul.³

1. Cf. 2.1, αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιθυμίαι.

2. 4 Macc. 1.31 f. It should be noted here that all English translations of texts are my own, except where explicitly stated otherwise.

3. Cf. A. D. Nock, Sallustius. Concerning the Gods and the Universe (Cambridge, Eng., 1926), p. lxvi, where it is stated that the idea of a reasonable and unreasonable soul both existing simultaneously in man is a "commonplace of Hellenistic philosophy." The doctrine has its roots in Plato; see e. g. *Timaeus* 69CD.

Plutarch on the δαιμόνιον of Socrates

In Plutarch's de genio Socratis, Simmias, one of the characters in the dialogue, recounts an oracular vision of one Timarchus of Chaeroneia. Timarchus, desirous of learning the nature of Socrates' famous inner voice, had consulted the oracle of Trophonius in Boeotia on the matter,¹ and had experienced there a vision of the celestial regions in which he saw various kinds of stars sinking down or shooting up from below. A mysterious voice explained what these were:

Every soul partakes of mind (ψυχὴ πᾶσα νοῦ μετέσχειν); none is completely irrational or deprived of mind. But whatever part of it is mixed with the flesh and passions is changed according to the pleasures and pains it undergoes and becomes irrational (ἄλογον). Not every soul is mixed in the same way. Some sink completely into the body and becoming thoroughly disordered are their whole life-long disrupted by passions. Others are mixed up somewhat, but leave outside their purest element, which is not drawn in but is like a buoy floating on the surface, attached to the top of a man's head, while he is as it were submerged in the deep. The soul is sustained around it and held fast insofar as it is obedient, and is not overcome with passions. Now that which is borne about submerged in the body is

1. For a good discussion of this oracle, see W. K. C. Guthrie, The Greeks and Their Gods (Boston, 1961), pp. 223-231. The fullest ancient account is that of Pausanias 9.39.5-14.

called the "soul" (τὸ μὲν οὖν ὑποβρύχιον ἐν τῷ σώματι φερόμενον ψυχὴ λέγεται), but that which is left free from corruption the many call "mind" (τὸ δὲ φθορᾶς λειψθὲν οἱ πολλοὶ νοῦν καλοῦντες), thinking it resides within themselves, just as they think that reflected images are in the mirrors that reflect them. But those who consider the matter correctly call it a daemon, regarding it as something external. Thus, Timarchus, . . . the stars that seem to be extinguished you must regard as the souls that sink completely into the body. The stars that re-appear from below and are lighted again are the souls which rise from the body again after death, shaking off a sort of dimness and gloom as one shakes off mud. But the stars that move about above are the daemons of men who are said to "have mind" (οἱ δὲ ἄνω διαφερόμενοι δαίμονές εἰσι τῶν νοῦν ἔχειν λεγομένων ἀνθρώπων).¹

The latter category of men is later referred to as τὸ μαντικὸν καὶ θεοκλυτούμενον γένος (592C), a race which presumably includes Socrates.

What is of special import in this passage is the division between the ψυχὴ and the νοῦς of man, the latter regarded as the heavenly element of man, the former as subject to the passions of the body. Men are differentiated from one another according to whether or not they allow the νοῦς to rule over them; and it is even suggested that men's souls can be so submerged in the passions of the body that they are completely bereft of νοῦς.

1. De genio Socratis 591 D-F.

This ψυχή-νοῦς differentiation is regarded as a commonplace; indeed what is new in the revelation received by Timarchus is the idea that the νοῦς is really a δαίμων, something external to man. Where Plutarch got this idea is not important for our purposes, though Leisegang may have been correct in attributing it to Posidonius.¹

Posidonius, et al.

We do know that Posidonius drew the conclusion from the premise of an irrational element in the soul that wickedness has its roots in the soul itself. This we have according to the testimony of Galen:

Posidonius is not of the opinion that wickedness comes to man from an external source, but on the contrary that it has its root in our own souls (ἔχουσιν ἰδίαν ρίζαν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν). Once it is set in motion (δρῶμένη) it

1. H. Leisegang, Der Heilige Geist (Leipzig, 1919), I, 109. He suggests this because of the similarity between this passage and some of the ideas of Philo who, he says, was profoundly influenced by Posidonius. On the vexatious problem of Posidonius--to whom so much has been attributed and from whom so little is actually preserved--see now Marie Laffranque, Poseidonios d'Apamée (Publications de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Paris, Série "Recherches," XIII; Paris, 1964). On Philo see below.

sprouts and grows. Thus the seed of wickedness is to be found within ourselves.¹

And Galen himself wrote a treatise entitled *περί ψυχῆς πάθων καὶ ἀμαρτημάτων*, in which at one point he quotes the proverb *Πάντων δὲ μάλιστ' αἰσχύνει σαυτὸν*, and gives advice on how to tame the *ἄλογος δύναμις* in one's soul.²

Philo reflects the view of contemporary philosophy of an *ἄλογον μέρος ψυχῆς*,³ which he defines as the *θυμικόν* and the *ἐπιθυμητικόν*.⁴ Philo goes beyond the bounds of Hellenistic philosophy in that he can even speak of the death of the soul, *ψυχικὸς θάνατος*.⁵

1. Galen, *Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur* (Scr. min. II, 78, 8 ff., Müller), translated from the Greek text as quoted in C. de Vogel, *Greek Philosophy* (Leiden, 1964), III, 262 (No. 1186).

2. J. Marquardt, *Observationes Criticae in Cl. Galeni Librum ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑΤΩΝ* (Leipzig, 1870), p. 40.

3. *Leg. All.* 1.24.

4. *Leg. All.* 1.72. The background of this statement is Plato's myth of the charioteer in *Phaedrus* 253d ff. For a full discussion of the rational and irrational soul in Philo, see Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), I, 389 ff.

5. *Leg. All.* 1.76. On this see below, p.56. Perhaps the possibility of the death of the soul is hinted at in the text from Plutarch quoted above. But such a doctrine is quite unusual in Hellenistic philosophy.

It is this complex of ideas which informs the use of the word $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Justin Martyr. In Dialogue 30.1 he speaks of the $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\eta\ \nu\acute{o}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ of the people of Israel.¹

The word $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$, therefore, if used to apply to the "irrational" or earth-bound part of the soul, can be understood as referring to an element in man which is inferior to the higher element, i. e., the $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$. So Marcus Aurelius, in his Meditations, can speak of man as tripartite, consisting of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$, $\psi\chi\eta$, and $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$. The $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ in this case is the seat of $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the $\psi\chi\eta$ of $\delta\rho\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}$, and the $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ of $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$.²

Hellenistic-Jewish Genesis Exegesis

When we move onto Hellenistic-Jewish soil, we tend to find (as in Philo above) the same use of the term soul, but for the higher, rational part a preference for the

1. Cf. Philo, Leg. All. 1.45 and Vita Cont. 2, for the same expression.

2. Meditations 3.16. At 12.3 he refers to the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ instead of the $\psi\chi\eta$, but $\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ is retained as the highest part of man. See de Vogel, Greek Philosophy, III, 331.

term πνεῦμα instead of νοῦς.¹ The locus classicus in the Old Testament which suggests this usage is Genesis 2.7 (in the LXX). For example, Josephus seems to suggest that man is basically a trichotomy, but for Josephus this trichotomy consists of dust from the earth, ψυχή, and πνεῦμα. This is evident in his paraphrase of Genesis 2.7:

ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
λαβὼν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνέθηκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχὴν. ὁ
δ' ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Ἀδάμ ἐκλήθη.

If, indeed, πνεῦμα and ψυχή do not constitute a hendiadys, there is a strong possibility that πνεῦμα functions in this passage (as it does elsewhere in Hellenistic Judaism) exactly as νοῦς does in non-Jewish Hellenistic thought, from which examples have been given above. If so, it is the Greek text of Genesis 2.7 that brings about this terminological shift.

1. Eduard Schweizer, in his Kittel article on πνεῦμα, says that no Greek parallels exist to the superiority of πνεῦμα over ψυχή. The opposition of "spirit" and "soul" is possible only in Jewish or Christian literature, or in literature influenced by Judaism or Christianity; see TWBNT, VI, 394. The reason for this is now clear, as is suggested above.

2. Ant. 1.34.

A similar understanding of man's ψυχή and πνεῦμα, again probably based on a tradition of exegesis of Genesis 2.7, enables Justin Martyr in Dialogue 5 to deny qualifiedly the immortality of the ψυχή. The matter is clarified in 6.2 (note particularly the term τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα):*

But just as a man does not live for all time, nor is body always joined to the soul, for when this union must be dissolved the soul leaves the body and the man is no more, so also when the soul must cease to exist, the life-giving spirit (τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα) is removed from it and the soul is no more but returns again whence it was taken.

Philo, alternating between νοῦς and πνεῦμα, also bases his usage of the latter term (when it is used instead of νοῦς) on his understanding of Genesis 2.7. For Philo the νοῦς or the πνεῦμα is the divine element in man.¹

The "Mithras-Liturgy"

Reitzenstein suggested that the πνευματικός-ψυχικός contrast in Paul was derived from the terminology of the

1. See below, pp. 49ff, for full discussion of the relevant texts.

* At this point in the Dialogue there is no philosophical school material reflected; he is arguing on the basis of the biblical text.

Hellenistic mystery-religions.¹ The one "mystery" text he brings to bear in his argument is from the so-called "Mithras Liturgy," dating from around the third century.² The relevant phrase in this text is τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μου ψυχικῆς δυνάμεως.³ In the context the mystes (if one may call him that) prays his mortal nature stand still so that he may attain to the vision of immortal Aion by means of immortal spirit. This is an interesting passage, for it may very well reflect a terminology arising originally from the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7. The Jewish character of this magical text has been established

1. Mysterienreligionen, p. 70. He argues that the technical use of the adjectives πνευματικός and ψυχικός makes a direct derivation from the Semitic impossible (*ibid.*, p. 71). To this it may be replied that there are Rabbinic adjectives corresponding to πνευματικός and ψυχικός; namely, נְפִישִׁי and נְשִׁמָּה. He is right, however, in saying that Paul did not derive his adjectives from the Semitic, since these Rabbinic terms are demonstrably later than Paul. On this see Billerbeck, III, 329.

2. Ed. by A. Dieterich, Eine Mithrasliturgie³ (Leipzig, 1923, r. p. Darmstadt, 1966). It is not a "liturgy" at all, but a magico-theurgic text dealing with ἀπαθανάτισμος. See M. P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion (Munich, 1961), II², 686 ff.; and especially Erik Peterson, "Die Befreiung Adams aus der Ἀνάγκη," in Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 107-128.

3. Dieterich (ed.), p. 4, line 24.

by Erik Peterson, who hypothesizes that the "actor" in the text is Adam.¹ A further possible allusion to Genesis 2.7 in this text is the phrase, πνεύση ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πνεῦμα, in line 14 of the same page in Dieterich's edition.²

Thus the portion of the Paris Papyrus containing the so-called "Mithras Liturgy" cannot supply us with the root of the ψυχικός terminology, but itself may reflect an exegetical tradition whose lines we have now begun to establish, and about which more will be said in the next chapter.

Jude 19

The word ψυχικός occurs in the New Testament outside of Paul only twice, and does not occur at all in

1. In Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis, pp. 110 ff. E. Schweizer conjectures that magic texts using the ψυχή-πνεῦμα terminology are influenced by Judaism or Christianity. See TWBNT, VI, 393.

2. Cf. also in the Leiden Papyrus (PGM, XII, 238 ff.) an invocation to Helios-Aeon-Iao-Sabaoth:

δεῦρό μοι, ὁ ἐκ τῶν δ' ἀν[έ]μων, ὁ παντοκράτωρ
θεός, ὁ ἐχψυσήσας πνεύματα ἀνθρώποις εἰς ζωὴν,
δέσποτα τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ καλῶν, ἐπάκουσόν μου, κύριε
.....

the Apostolic Fathers. In Jude 19 the heretics against whom the author is inveighing are described as οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. The term ψυχικός here is defined in a manner that conforms to the Pauline definition: the ψυχικός man is the one who does not have the Spirit of God.¹ The term seems to be one that the heretics (probably Gnostics) used to apply to non-gnostic Christians; this is suggested by the word ἀποδιορίζοντες. Jude has wrested the term from his opponents and used it against them, defining it in a Pauline way. The reference in 17-18 to "apostles" may indicate that a use of Paul was involved on the part of the opponents. Second Peter 3.15 indicates, at least, that the heretics of that epistle relied on Paul for their authority, and the heresies described in Jude and 2 Peter seem to be quite similar. However, a reference to Paul in Jude cannot be pressed too far, since Paul is not explicitly mentioned. Nor does the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology occur in 2 Peter.²

1. Cf. 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. and the discussion thereon, pp. 71 ff., esp. 113 f.

2. J. Dupont, Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de saint Paul² (Louvain, 1960), p. 153, also thinks that there is some Pauline influence behind Jude 19.

James 3.15

The use of the word $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in James 3.15 is fraught with difficulties. It is used not as an anthropological term (except in a derivative sense), but simply as a pejorative adjective. One thing seems quite clear: neither "James" nor the recipients of his letter can in any sense be referred to as "Gnostics."¹

Dibelius attempts to solve the problem by saying simply that $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ is a technical term taken over and used out of context, just exactly as the expression $\tau\rho\omicron\chi\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ in James 3.6.²

Can it be legitimately argued that the source of this "technical term" is to be located in an environment of Jewish-Christian wisdom theology which is closely related to the discussion between Paul and his opponents

1. Contra Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 91. This has been correctly perceived by Dibelius, Der Brief des Jakobus¹⁰ (Meyer, Göttingen, 1959), p. 195. For the argument that the opponents in the epistles are Gnostics, see also H. Schammberger, Die Einheitlichkeit des Jk. im antignostischen Kampf (1936), which, however, was unfortunately inaccessible to me.

2. Jakobus, p. 195. On Jas. 3.6 see p. 182.

in 1 Corinthians?¹ Is there any "Pauline" tradition discernible in James 3?² The relation between the Epistle of James and Paul is a question of debate. If Dibelius is right, some relationship can be posited, for he says that James 2.14 ff. is unintelligible "ohne dass Paulus zuvor die Losung 'Glaube, nicht Werke' ausgegeben hatte."³ This is, in my view, a correct judgment.

But further, the relationship between James and Paul is not limited to James 2 and the faith/works contrast exemplified in Romans and Galatians. Indeed there does seem to be a considerable relationship between James 3.13-18 and other Pauline passages, notably 1 Corinthians 2-3. For example, compare τὶς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστημῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ; (Jas. 3.13) and εἴ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν . . . (1 Cor. 3.18). Again, compare μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε (Jas. 3.14)

1. U. Luck has recently posited a common background in "wisdom" theology as the constitutive factor in explaining the parallels between James and Paul; see "Weisheit und Leiden," ThLZ, 92 (1967), 253-258.

2. Cf. H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," NTS, 12 (1965/66), 231-244, and his theory of an on-going "Schule des Paulus" (p. 233).

3. Jakobus, p. 167. He does point out, however, that there is no question in James of a direct polemic against Paul, or against the epistle to the Romans.

and the warnings against boasting in 1 Corinthians 1.29-31 and 3.21.¹ The word ἐπίγειος occurs frequently in Paul*, and outside of Paul only in John 3.12 and James 3.15. The occurrence of the vices ζῆλος and ἐριθεία in James 3.14,16 are parallel to the Corinthian ζῆλος and ἔρις against which Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 3.3. Furthermore the term ἐριθεία itself is a favorite in Paul² and occurs outside of Paul only in James in the New Testament.³ James 3 therefore is seen to contain elements which are peculiarly Pauline, and not easily explainable as common elements of a wider context of early Christian language. Herein lies the explanation for the occurrence of the expression ψυχικὴ σοφία in James 3.15. ψυχικὴ σοφία is itself not an attested Pauline expression, but it is reminiscent of σαρκικὴ σοφία in 2 Corinthians 1.12,

1. The compound κατακαυχᾶσθαι occurs in the N. T. only in Rom. 11.8 and in James 2.13 and 3.14; it does not occur in the Apostolic Fathers. The verb καυχᾶσθαι is a favorite word in the Pauline corpus, but outside of Paul it occurs in the N. T. only in James 1.9 and 4.16.

2. Rom. 2.8; 2. Cor. 12.20; Gal. 5.20; Phil. 1.17 and 2.3.

3. In the Apostolic Fathers it occurs only in Ignatius Phld. 8.2, and only very rarely in later patristic literature; see PGL, p. 549.

* See especially Phil. 3.19 where the word is used in a manner similar to that of James 3.15.

also in a context of warning against *καύχησις*. And, of course, *σοφία* forms the subject of Paul's remarks in 1 Corinthians 2-3; the occurrence of the term *ψυχικός* in this context could account for the phrase *ψυχικὴ σοφία* in James.

Thus the occurrence of the term *ψυχικός* in James is best explained on the basis of a dependence of James' language upon Pauline terminology. This dependence is, in my opinion, best explained as a literary one; i.e. the author of James has read 1 Corinthians. But if this is going too far, Conzelmann's theory of a "school of Paul" would also adequately explain the relationship between the terminology of James and that of Paul.¹

1. Either of these theories has important consequences for the study of the epistle of James as a whole, its date and its provenance.

Chapter III
IMMORTALITY AND RESURRECTION IN
1 CORINTHIANS 15

The Context

The crucial passage for our purposes is 1 Corinthians 15.44-49, but it is necessary to see it in its context, i.e. in the context of Paul's argument on the resurrection of the dead. An outline of the entire chapter is helpful here, and that of J. Weiss commends itself:¹

- vv. 1-11: "Grundliegende Einleitung"
- vv. 12-34: Part I, answering the opponents' assertion, ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν.
- vv. 35-57: Part II, πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί;
- v. 58: "Ein kerniges Schlusswort"

1. See J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief⁹ (Meyer, Göttingen, 1910), pp. 345, 353, 367, and 380.

Part II I would break up into two parts, as follows:

vv. 35-50: ποίῳ σώματι;

vv. 51-57: τὸ μυστήριον

Verse 50 belongs to the argument in the preceding verses, but also functions as a transitional passage to what follows.

I see no reason not to take the statement in 15.12 as it stands, i.e. that there were people in Corinth who actually said ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν. To be sure, this passage has often been interpreted in terms of a "realized resurrection" such as that which seems to have been advocated by Hymenaeus and Philetus, according to 2 Timothy 2.18 (ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι).¹ It seems to me preferable, on the basis of the clear statement in 15.12 and the whole context of Paul's argument, to posit the existence in Corinth of people who denied the resurrection of the body, people for whom the doctrine of an

1. Most recently by B. Schneider, "The Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor. 15.45b," CBQ, 29 (1967), 144. For other literature see E. Brandenburger, Adam und Christus (WMANT 7; Neukirchen, 1962), p. 70.

ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν was an impossible and superfluous notion.¹

On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the opponents denied categorically any doctrine of afterlife at all.² Paul's rather hyperbolic argument appears at places (19, 30-34) to be directed against such a denial, but this can be understood when his Pharisaic background is taken into account.³ Paul believed that "he that says that there is no resurrection of the dead" has "no share in the world to come."⁴ Paul reminds the Corinthians that they have received and affirmed the Christian gospel as

1. νεκρός means, basically, "corpse." To people whose native tongue was Greek, the doctrine of the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν would probably be repugnant.

2. This thesis, proposed by Albert Schweitzer, has recently been revived by K. Smyth, "Heavenly Man and Son of Man in St. Paul," SPCIC I (Rome, 1961), 229.

3. Cf. Phil. 3.5. The picture of Paul's affirmation of the resurrection presented in Acts 17.32 and especially 23.6, though possibly not historically factual, is entirely credible. An interesting point of contact with the sentiments attacked in v. 32 has recently been turned up in the form of a "Sadducean" tomb including amongst its inscriptions one in Greek: ἐλθαίνετε οἱ ζῶντες / [τ]οῦ δὲ (λοι)πὸ[ν] πρὶν ὅμα φα[γεῖν]. The inscription dates from Hasmonean times. See on this inscription Benoit, "L'inscription grecque du tombeau de Jason," IEJ 17 (1967), 112-113.

4. Cf. Mishnah Sanhedrin 10.1.

he proclaimed it to them, and argues from the standpoint of a common affirmation that Christ is not dead, but alive.¹ On the Corinthian side this need not have included a belief in the bodily resurrection of Christ, for it was apparently possible from the beginning in the primitive church to interpret the exaltation of Christ in terms which did not necessarily include his bodily resurrection.²

What, then, did the opponents believe concerning life after death? By far the most probable assumption is that they affirmed a doctrine of immortality and regarded a resurrection of the body as superfluous, if not altogether repugnant.³ Johannes Weiss has summed up succinctly the

1. Cf. K. Wegenast, Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen (WMANT 8; Neukirchen, 1962), pp. 66 f.

2. On this Christology and its Hellenistic-Jewish background see D. Georgi, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11," in Zeit und Geschichte (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 263-293. Such a Christology may underlie the exaltation doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews as well. That such a Christology was alive in Corinth is very probable. This is why Paul stresses so firmly the resurrection of Christ from the dead. The clause καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη may also function as a Pauline affirmation of Christ's bodily resurrection.

3. Cf. here the statement of Justin Martyr, for whom the doctrine of resurrection has already become a necessary sign of orthodoxy: in Dialogue 80.4, he refers to λεγόμενοι Χριστιανοί . . . οἱ καὶ λεγούσι μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλὰ ὅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς

prevailing thinking in the Hellenistic world on this point:

Eine Wiederbelebung des Körpers ist dem rationalistischen Sinne der Hellenen nicht nur höchst unwahrscheinlich . . . sondern dieser spiritualistischen Richtung nicht einmal erwünscht; sie würde ja nur eine neue Einkerkierung der Seele bedingen.¹

Weiss thought that Paul's arguments were directed against two sides: a Hellenistic denial of bodily resurrection on the one hand, and a crass Jewish belief in bodily resuscitation on the other.² As we shall see, he was quite correct on the first point, but incorrectly interpreted 15.50 in positing a second front of opponents.³

τοὺς οὐρανόν. In Justin's opinion, these "so-called Christians" blaspheme the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in denying the resurrection, and should no more be called "Christians" than Sadducees and other Jewish sectarians should be called "Jews." The reference to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in connection with resurrection may be traditional; see Mt. 22.31-32; Mk. 12.26-27; Lk. 20.37-38.

1. Korintherbrief, p. 344.

2. Ibid., pp. 308, 345.

3. W. L. Knox correctly perceived the situation in 1 Cor. 15, but then went on to say that Paul changed his mind in 2 Cor. 5, abandoning the doctrine of resurrection in favor of the immortality of the soul. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1939), p. 127. C. F. D. Moule has recently--incorrectly, in my opinion--argued that there is a change of view from 1 Cor. 15 to 2 Cor. 5; see "St. Paul and Dualism," NTS 13 (1965/6), 106-123.

On 1 Cor. 15.46, Schmithals argues that Paul is polemicizing against Gnostics who thought that the pneumatic self was older than the psychic=fleshly substance in which the heavenly Pneuma-self has been incarcerated by the demonic powers.¹ The manner in which the passage is phrased (ἀλλ' οὐ . . . ἀλλά) indicates that Paul is polemicizing here, and it is probable that the opponents are indeed arguing for the priority of their pneumatic existence over their psychic. Schmithals' interpretation, however, goes beyond the evidence in the mythological details he reads into it.

The difficulty of this passage is the use of the neuter τὸ πνευματικόν, τὸ ψυχικόν, which according to the

1. Gnosis, p. 159. Schmithals makes this verse, with its allegedly "antignostische Tendenz" the proof of his interpretation of 2 Cor. 11.4, and the basis of his interpretation of the rest of the passages in 1 and 2 Cor. which refer to the Spirit (cf. p. 160). But then he undercuts his own thesis in a footnote by saying that v. 46 "als Glosse auszuschneiden ist" (p. 160, f.n. 2). He says this because he had argued previously (pp. 146 f.) that Paul wrote 1 Cor. 15 at a time when he was not informed as to the opponents' teachings in their denial of the resurrection, believing that the Corinthians were denying all future hope, unaware that the Corinthian denial of resurrection was actually the triumphant message of those who considered themselves to be φύσει σωζόμενοι. In a note on p. 325 of the revised edition, Schmithals refers to E. Brandenburger's Adam und Christus, p. 74, with the comment, "Gehört v. 46 zum ursprünglichen Text, so ist er formal als Parenthese zu beurteilen."

preceding context seems to modify σῶμα. Thus, Eduard Schweizer thinks that Paul is arguing against opponents who viewed the σῶμα πνευματικόν as something already given to the believer, something hidden beneath the "psychic" body, and which survives death.¹ But it is difficult to understand the specific context of such a belief. The closest thing to it would be the neo-Platonic doctrine of the πνεῦμα as the ὄχημα τῆς ψυχῆς. It is this philosophical context in which the use of the term τὸ πνευματικόν σῶμα in Philoponus' introduction to Aristotle's De Anima is to be placed.² Such a doctrine, however, is not attested as early as 1 Corinthians, nor can this passage in 1 Corinthians 15 be adduced as evidence for it once the context has been clarified.

According to the context, the words πνευματικόν σῶμα and ψυχικόν σῶμα cannot be attributed to the opponents

1. TWBNT VI, 417 f. Cf. also H. Clavier, "Brèves remarques sur la notion de σῶμα πνευματικόν," in The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology (Cambridge, 1954, r.p. 1964), pp. 342-362.

2. Quoted in J. J. Wetstein, Novum Testamentum Graecum (Amsterdam, 1751-2), II, 171. Philoponus flourished in the sixth century A.D. On the earlier neo-Platonic doctrine of the vehicle of the soul see E. R. Dodds, Proclus: The Elements of Theology (Oxford, 1963), Appendix II, pp. 313-321.

at all, but only to Paul. These terms are governed by Paul's diatribic question in v. 35 and his statement in v. 37 about τὸ σῶμα γενησόμενον on the one hand, and the polarity in v. 45 between ψυχὴν ζῶσαν and πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν on the other. The basic point of contact between Paul and his opponents is not the concept of a "spiritual body" but the exegesis of Genesis 2.7b.

Hellenistic-Jewish Genesis-Exegesis

It is now possible to make more concrete what has heretofore been only the most probable assumption: the opponents of Paul in Corinth believed in the immortality of the soul, and not the resurrection of the body. And they held to this doctrine on the basis of Scripture! For a careful study of the way in which Paul quotes Genesis 2.7b in 1 Corinthians 15.45 leads to the conclusion that his use of this passage from Genesis is a polemic one. Paul quotes it, "targumizes" upon it, and re-interprets it to refute his opponents' use of Genesis 2.7b to prove their doctrine of immortality. What this doctrine was, and how they interpreted Genesis 2.7, is presently to be examined.

Some scholars have seen in 1 Corinthians 15.45ff. a polemic against Philonic doctrine of two Adams based on the two creation accounts in Genesis.¹ Paul is made to reverse the Philonic order: the first, heavenly man is really the second, i.e. Christ.

But this is an interpretation that must be clarified. It is important to note that Philo had two different--even contradictory--interpretations of Genesis 1.27. This has been admirably elucidated by J. Jervell, who has shown that the "Platonic" interpretation of Genesis 1.27 (where the ἄνθρωπος is referred to as ἰδέα τις, as in Op. 134) plays no role at all in Philo's anthropology; it has only an ethical function.² Philo's anthropology can be seen best in those passages in which he merges Genesis 1.27 with Genesis 2.7. In this case the

1. See Philo, Leg. All. 1.31 ff.; Op. 134; Quaest. Gen. 1.4. Among those who see a polemic against such a doctrine as is known from these Philonic texts are H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I.II⁴ (HNT; Tübingen, 1949), p. 85, and J. Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, trans. A. Heathcote and P. Allcock (London, 1962), p. 178.

2. J. Jervell, Imago Dei (FRLANT 58; Göttingen, 1960), pp. 53 ff. Cf. Brandenburger, Adam und Christus, p. 118. Brandenburger stresses that the Platonizing aspect of Philo's anthropological speculations should not be brought into the background of 1 Cor. 15.

Logos is the εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, and God creates man οὐχὶ εἰκόνα θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατ' εἰκόνα (Genesis 1.27).¹ The "man" referred to here is the λόγικον μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς, i.e. the νοῦς or πνεῦμα in man (Genesis 2.7).²

It is this latter spectrum of ideas in Philo which has relevance for the theories of Paul's opponents in 1 Corinthians 15, inasmuch as these ideas have to do with a widespread Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7.³ This Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is of crucial importance for an understanding of the Corinthian opponents' anthropology, and of their use of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός (-χοϊκός) terminology.⁴

1. Quis Her. 231.

2. Jervell, p. 55. Jervell sees Gnostic influence here, but these speculations are easily accounted for on the basis of the modified Stoic philosophy which Philo uses as a hermeneutical tool. Of course, these speculations are to be understood as one of the matrices out of which Gnosticism developed. On Gnostic exegesis of Gen. 2.7 see Chapter Six.

3. See Chapter Two, pp. 28 ff.

4. After my ideas on this had already congealed, I noticed that J. Dupont had already arrived at a somewhat similar position: see Gnosis, pp. 172 ff. Though the originality that I had assumed for my argument has thereby been dissipated, I nevertheless rejoice in seeing these views essentially corroborated. I believe, however, that I am arguing the case more fully and clearly than he; in

The advantage of this thesis is not only that it gives us a theological context in which to understand Paul's argumentation in 1 Corinthians 15, with his obviously polemical exegesis of Genesis 2.7, but that it provides us with a very plausible historical context as well. For there is solid evidence of the existence in Corinth of a Hellenistic Jewish synagogue,¹ and we are well-informed concerning the activity in Corinth of the Alexandrian Jew, Apollos.² I am of the opinion that Apollos' role in

addition he has not seen the importance of this spectrum of ideas as one of the matrices of gnostic speculation. On this see Chapter Six.

1. The famous inscription from the Corinthian excavations (No. 111 in Corinth, VIII.1, p. 78), [ἐννα]ῶν ἑβραίων, is probably too late, due to the style of lettering, to be used as first-century evidence. But we know of such a synagogue from Acts 18.4 ff., and also from 1 Cor. 1.14*. On the role of the Diaspora synagogue in Hellenistic-Jewish scripture exegesis, see e.g. Georgi, Gegner, pp. 99 ff. And on the influence of Hellenistic Jewish synagogue theology in 1 Cor. in particular, see N. Dahl, "Paulus apostel og menigheten i Korinth (1 Kor. 1-4)," NTT 54 (1953), 7.

2. Acts 18.24 ff. and 19.1; 1 Cor. 1.12 and 3.4 ff., 22; 4.6; and 16.12. Of course, the Acts account concerning Apollos' knowing only the baptism of John is erroneous. On this see E. Käsemann, "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," in Essays on New Testament Themes (SBT 41; London, 1964), pp. 136 ff. R. M. Grant stresses the role of Apollos in the discussions between Paul and his opponents on "Wisdom"; see "The Wisdom of the Corinthians," in The Joy of Study (New York, 1951), p. 55. Also on the

* Crispus, the archisynagogos (Acts. 18.8) is mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor. 1.14.

Corinth is a factor of great importance for the development there of a Christianity influenced by the traditions of Diaspora Judaism. The description in Acts of Apollos' exegetical ability I take to be genuine and of great moment for our understanding of the doctrines of the Corinthian opponents.¹

The following survey of texts illustrating the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 will make clear not only the origins of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology, but the theological background and context for the basic contrasts in 1 Corinthians 15.45 ff.: ψυχὴ-πνεῦμα, πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν-τὸ ψυχικόν, πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος-δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος, χοϊκός-ἐπουράνιος, φθορά-ἀφθαρσία, θνητόν-ἀθανασία, εἰκὼν τοῦ χοϊκοῦ-εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπουρανίου.

In Op. 135 Philo interprets Genesis 2.7 to mean that man is a composite creation made up of earthly substance and divine spirit (ἐκ τε γεώδους οὐσίας καὶ πνεύματος θεοῦ) and that man was

role of Apollos in this connection see H. Koester's review of Wilckens' Weisheit und Torheit in Gnomon 33 (1961), 591.

1. Is 1 Cor. 4.6 a reflection of Apollos' exegetical activity? On the other hand, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται may be a scribal gloss. On this J. Strugnell is soon publishing an important article.

made both mortal and immortal at the same time, mortal as regards the body, but as regards the mind, immortal (κατὰ δὲ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀθάνατον).

In Leg. All. 3.161 Philo says,

For there are two things of which we consist, soul and body. The body is fashioned from the earth (ἐκ γῆς δεδημιουργηται), but the soul is of the upper air, a divine fragment (ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ αἰθέρος ἐστίν, ἀπόσπασμα θεῖον); 'for God breathed into his face a breath of life (πνεῦμα ζωῆς), and man became a living soul.'¹

In Som 1.34, commenting on the incorporeal mind within man (the context is an allegorical interpretation of Leviticus 19.24), Philo says,

For that which is holy among things that have come into being is, in the universe, the heaven, and in man, the mind, since it is a divine fragment (νοῦς, ἀπόσπασμα θεῖον ὢν), as Moses, especially, says: 'He breathed into his face a breath of life (πνεῦμα ζωῆς), and man became a living soul.'

In Quis Her. 55 ff., Philo grapples with a problem which would naturally be a difficult one to a Hellenistic exegete; namely, the radical difference between the Old Testament view of ψυχὴ (ψυχή) and the Greek view. Because

1. The phrase ἀπόσπασμα θεῖον is a Stoic term. See e.g. Epictetus, Diss. 1.14.6; 2.8.11; see also on this F. Cumont, Lux Perpetua (Paris, 1949), p. 113; and M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa (Göttingen, 1955), I, 229 ff. On the aetherial substance of the soul according to Philo, see further Quis Her. 281-284.

Moses states in Leviticus 17.11 that ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκός

αἷμά ἐστιν, Philo must posit two senses for the word "soul":

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ψυχὴ διχῶς λέγεται, ἢ τε ὅλη καὶ
τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν αὐτῆς μέρος, ὃ κυρίως εἰπεῖν
ψυχὴ ψυχῆς ἐστὶ¹

The dominant part of the soul, i.e. the mind, is
according to Philo that which is referred to in Genesis 2.7:

ἐνεφύσησε γὰρ φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων εἰς
τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ
ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ἥ καὶ κατὰ τὴν
εἰκόνα τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγος ἔχει τυπωθῆναι.²

Notice that Philo here expressly treats the νοῦς
of man as that which was created κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα (Gen.
1.27). Furthermore, from his statements about the two-fold
quality of man's soul, he draws the conclusion that there
are two kinds of men (διττὸν εἶδος ἀνθρώπων), those who
live θεῖῳ πνεύματι λογισμῷ, and those who live αἵματι καὶ
σαρκὸς ἡδονῇ. The latter reflect their origin as a πλάσμα
γῆς; the former their origin as an ἐκμαγεῖον θείας εἰκόνας.³

1. Quis Her. 55.

2. Ibid. 56.

3. Ibid. 57. This passage cannot be harmonized with
Philo's statements concerning the διττὰ ἀνθρώπων γένη in
Leg. All. 1.31. What is involved in these two passages is
two different and contradictory interpretations of Gen.
1.27. The passage in Leg. All. I would regard as "Platonic";
the one in Quis Her., "Stoic." Cf. the text from Plutarch's
de genio Socratis quoted in Chapter Two, pp. 24 f.

In Spec. Leg. 4.123, Philo remarks that blood is prohibited because οὐσία ψυχῆς ἐστίν , but not of the νοεράς καὶ λογικῆς soul, only of that soul which man has in common with irrational animals. But the essence of the former is πνεῦμα θεῶν , as Moses says:

ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ ἀρχηγέτῃ τοῦ γένους
 ἡμῶν ἐμφυσῆσαι πνοὴν ζωῆς τὸν θεὸν εἰς
 τὸ . . . πρόσωπον . . .

Again, in Det. 80, Philo deals with the apparent contradiction in Moses concerning the soul, that the οὐσία τῆς ψυχῆς is αἷμα (Lev. 17.11), and that the οὐσία τῆς ψυχῆς is πνεῦμα (Gen. 2.7). Philo solves this contradiction by asserting that each of us is two in number (ἐκάστον ἡμῶν . . . ἀριθμῶ δύο εἶναι), a vital (ζωτικῇ) element which we share with other creatures, and a rational (λογικῇ) element which we have from God.¹ Insofar as man's soul is spirit (ἀνθρώπου δὲ ψυχὴν πνεῦμα) we are a θεοειδὲς δημιουργήμα , whose roots are in heaven.²

μόνον γὰρ δὴ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς φυτὸν οὐράνιον
 ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον εἰργάσατο.³

1. Det. 82.

2. Ibid. 84.

3. Ibid. 85. This sentence must be compared to Plato's Timaeus 90a, where it is stated that we are, so far as our soul is concerned, οὐρανίον οὐκ ἐγγεῖον ἀλλὰ οὐράνιον. Cf. Plant. 17, where Philo quotes the same Platonic passage more fully: φυτὸν οὐκ ἐπίγειον ἀλλ' οὐράνιον.

Finally, in Plant. 18, Philo quotes Genesis 2.7 in proof of his statement that man's λογικὴ ψυχὴ is affirmed by Moses

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου πνεύματος ἐκείνου δόκιμον
εἶναι νόμισμα σημειωθὲν καὶ τυπωθὲν σφραγίδι
θεοῦ, ἥς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστὶν ὁ αἰδῖος λόγος,

and that man is therefore κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι.

All of these passages demonstrate that Genesis 2.7 is a crucial text for showing on a scriptural basis that man is not only mortal but also immortal. In some of these passages, we have noted that Genesis 2.7 is brought into conjunction with Genesis 1.27 and the doctrine of the εἰκὼν.¹ In other references to Genesis 2.7, no mention is made of the εἰκὼν, and Genesis 1.27 is not brought into the picture,² except perhaps by implication. In either case Genesis 2.7 is the crucial text, for it is used to explain the essence of empirical man, man as he is on this earth, a creature of both mortal soul and immortal spirit.³ Earthly man, deriving his body and lower part of the soul from the earth, is secondary to heavenly man, the νοῦς

1. Quis Her. 55 ff.; Plant. 18.

2. Op. 135; Leg. All. 3.161; Som. 1.34; Spec. Leg. 4.123; and Det. 84.

3. Though this was not explicit in all of the passages quoted above, the testimony of all of them together is clear on this point.

or πνεῦμα which inhabits empirical man. Thus we have in the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 the germ of the contrast held out by the Corinthian opponents of Paul between the πνευματικός man and the ψυχικός-χοϊκός man, and the priority of the former over the latter, by virtue of his sharing in the divine Spirit, or the divine εἰκὼν (the Logos, as in Philo, or Wisdom, as in the Wisdom of Solomon 7.26).

Philo is not the only witness of the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7. There is in passages of the Wisdom of Solomon additional evidence of the use of Genesis 2.7 (in conjunction with Genesis 1.27, as in some of the Philonic texts) as a proof-text for the immortality of man's higher being.

In Wisdom of Solomon 2.1-5 there is set forth the basis upon which ungodly men feel free to pursue a life of hedonism (vv. 6-9) and to oppress the weak and the righteous (vv. 10 ff.). The basis for their conduct is alleged by the author of the Wisdom of Solomon to be their view of the impermanence and mortality of man. Wisdom of Solomon 2.2b-3 is probably pertinent for our purposes, since it seems to reflect Genesis 2.7:

ὅτι καπνὸς ἡ πνοὴ ἐν ῥισὶν ἡμῶν, καὶ
ὁ λόγος σπινθήρ ἐν κινήσει καρδίας ἡμῶν,
οὐ βεσθέντος τέφρα ἀποβήσεται τὸ σῶμα,
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διαχυθήσεται ὡς χαῦνος ἀήρ.

Here the πνοή which God breathed ἐν ῥισὶν ἡμῶν¹ is regarded by the ungodly as mere "smoke" (καπνός), and man's rational soul (λόγος) as a spark (σπινθήρ) which has its seat only in man's καρδία, rather than in the divine Spirit. The spirit (πνεῦμα) in man, says the ungodly oppressor, becomes as much like thin air (χαῦνος ἀήρ) as the body becomes ashes (τέφρα).

This impious view of man is regarded by the author of Wisdom of Solomon to be a reflection of the culpable ignorance of the ungodly, for the true view of man is, according to Wisdom of Solomon 2.23,

ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ
καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἀϊδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν.

Here we observe that Genesis 2.7 and 1.27 are both in the background, and that that part of man as was created ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ and as an εἰκόνα τῆς ἀϊδιότητος τοῦ θεοῦ is man's λόγος or πνεῦμα, or in Philo's terms, his λογικὴ ψυχὴ or his νοῦς.² Man is, therefore, potentially³ immortal and incorruptible. The death of the righteous is

1. Cf. Heb. of Gen. 2.7, לְרִיחַ, whereas the LXX has εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον.

2. Det. 80 ff.; Som. 134; etc.

3. This is important; see below.

only an apparent death (Wis. Sol. 3.2), for in reality their souls are in the hand of God and their hope is full of immortality (ἀθανασίας, Wis. Sol. 3.4). The idolatrous man, however, will die; his hope is cheaper than dirt (γῆς εὐτελεστέρα), and his life of less value than clay (πηλοῦ τε ἀτιμότερος, Wis. Sol. 15.10),

ὅτι ἠγνόησεν τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτόν,
καὶ τὸν ἐμπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν
καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν (15.11).

Wilfully ignorant of man's potential for immortality given him in creation by God, the idolatrous and ungodly will forfeit it and perish. But those whose souls harbor Wisdom become friends of God (7.27) and are assured of their immortality (8.13,17).

This evidence of the use of Genesis 2.7 (and 1.27) in Hellenistic Diaspora-Judaism for the doctrine of immortality is conclusive. But here we must parenthetically make absolutely clear what the immortality of man in Diaspora Judaism meant, and what it did not mean. No Jew, not even Philo, could go so far as to assert with Plato that the soul was immortal by its very nature and therefore incapable of mortality. For even the most Hellenized of Jews, immortality was conditional. This we have already observed in the case of the Wisdom of Solomon, in the

texts cited above, in which it is the soul's participation in Wisdom which guarantees immortality.¹ In 4 Maccabees, it is εὐσέβεια which is the ὁδὸς ἐπ' ἀθανασίας (14.5). The seven martyred brothers, by their εὐσέβεια, attain immortality for their souls while their bodies come into dissolution (14.6-10). For Philo, also, immortality is ultimately granted to the soul by God conditionally. Immortality is conditional upon εὐσέβεια and δσιότης,² ἀρετή,³ or φιλοσοφία.⁴ Thus, for Philo, eternal death is the lot of the souls of the impious.⁵ As we shall see, this feature of the doctrine of immortality is evident also in the teaching of Paul's opponents in Corinth, where σοφία seems to be one of the deciding factors.⁶

1. This is the background for the Corinthian opponents' boasting of Wisdom. See Chapter Four.

2. Op. 155.

3. Quaest. Gen. 1.57; Conf. 149; etc.

4. Op. 77; Gig. 14.

5. Post. 39; Quaest. Gen. 1.16, 51; cf. Leg. All. 1.107 f.

6. Genesis 2.7 plays a major role in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul in patristic literature; see H. Wolfson, "Immortality and Resurrection in the Philosophy of the Church Fathers," in K. Stendahl (ed.), Immortality and Resurrection (New York, 1965), p. 80. In patristic

Genesis 2.7 in Qumran and in Rabbinic Exegesis

Very instructive is the use of Genesis 2.7 in Qumran and by the Rabbis, for it forms a striking contrast to the interpretations we have noted above.

In the Qumran texts man is never regarded as the "image of God," nor is Genesis 2.7b ever used--as in Diaspora Judaism--to prove man's immortality. Indeed, insofar as Genesis 2.7 functions at all in Qumran, it functions only on the basis of the first part of the verse, where man's earthly origin is emphasized.¹

For example, in 1QS XI.20 f. there is this estimate of man:

And what is the son of man himself
amidst all thy marvellous works?
And he that is born of woman,
what is his worth before thee?
Truly, this man was shaped from dust
(ִלְבָּנִים ִלְבָּנִים ִלְבָּנִים ִלְבָּנִים)
and his end is to become the prey of worms.²

theology, however, the immortality of the soul is usually wedded (somewhat illogically) to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

1. See Jervell, Imago Dei, p. 17, n. 6, and pp. 59 f.

2. Trans. by G. Vermes in A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran (Cleveland, 1962), p. 103; for the text I have used E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran (Darmstadt, 1964), p. 42. Similar references to man as "dust" are to be found in 1 QH III.21; X.4 ff.; XII.24; etc.

When we turn to the Rabbinic materials, we discover, first of all, that Genesis 2.7b is quoted very seldom.

Billerbeck states that "in der rabbinischen Literatur hat die Stelle nur wenig Verwendung gefunden."¹ And of the few references there are to this passage, Genesis 2.7b is never--so far as I have been able to determine--used as a proof-text for immortality.

Indeed, at one place at least it is concluded that man is mortal--not immortal--precisely because of the fact that Adam was endowed with life "by breathing" (בְּנִפְיָהוּ). Man's mortality in this world (בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה) is contrasted with his reception of life in the time to come (לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא), when he shall receive life as a gift (כְּתִּיבָה); the proof-text for this latter assertion is Ezekiel 37.14.²

At Genesis Rabba 14.7 we read that R. Jose b. R. Halafta (ca. 150 A.D.), in answering a heretic who denied the resurrection by quoting Psalm 2.9, likened man to a glass vessel which can be repaired because it is made by

1. Billerbeck, III, 477.

2. Genesis Rabba 14.8, trans. H. Freedman and M. Simon (Soncino, London, 1939), p. 116; for the text I have used C. Albeck, Bereschit Rabba (Berlin, 1929), p. 132.

blowing:¹

If what is made with the breath of a mere mortal (lit. "flesh and blood"-- *בשר ודם*) can be repaired, how much the more what is made with the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He!²

Thus, the Rabbi argues, man's body is reparable, like a glass vessel, because it is made by blowing, in contrast to a potter's vessel which cannot be repaired. Therefore there shall be a resurrection. Note, however, that there is here no trace of the notion that man has within him an immortal soul or a divine spirit on account of the inbreathing of God, as was the case in the Hellenistic Jewish exegesis noted above.³

Indeed, such a doctrine seems to be avoided in the Targums on Genesis 2.7. Weiss quotes Targum Pseudo-Jonathan as follows:

Und es schuf Gott den Menschen mit zwei Trieben,
und er nahm Staub von der Stätte des Heiligtums
und von den 4 Winden der Welt und mischte ihn von
allen Wassern der Welt und schuf ihn rot, braun,
und weiss und hauchte in seine Nase Hauch des
Lebens, und es ward der Hauch im Körper des

1. The same parable of earthen and glass vessels occurs in the Gospel of Philip 51.

2. Soncino, p. 115; Albeck, p. 131; (parentheses mine).

3. On Adam as golem see Chapter Six, pp. 153 ff.

Menschen ($\chi \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \nu \alpha \nu$) zu einem $\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \lambda \omicron \gamma \iota \kappa \acute{o} \nu$
zu erleuchten die Augen und vernehmen zu lassen
die Ohren.¹

The same expression $\chi \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \nu \alpha \nu$ occurs also in
Targum Onkelos² on Genesis 2.7 and in Targum Neofiti.³

The most important use of Genesis 2.7 in Rabbīnic
circles revolves around the doctrine of resurrection.

Here we encounter interpretations which are early enough
in point of time to have been known by the Pharisee Paul.

On the word $\chi \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \nu \alpha \nu$ in Genesis 2.7a there evolved
a controversy between the school of Hillel and the school
of Shammai. Both Hillel and Shammai agreed that there were

two formations, one in this world and one in the
future world ($\chi \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \nu \alpha \nu$, $\chi \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \nu \alpha \nu$,
 $\chi \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \nu \alpha \nu$).

But according to Shammai,

His formation in the next world will not be like
that of this world. In this world skin and flesh
are formed first, the sinews and bones last; but
in the future, he will commence with sinews and
bones and finish with the skin and flesh, for
thus it says in connection with the dead of
Ezekiel: 'And I beheld, and lo, there were sinews

1. Korintherbrief, p. 374.

2. Text in A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, vol. 1
(Leiden, 1959).

3. I was able to examine this document through the
courtesy of my colleague, Sheldon Isenberg.

upon them, and flesh came up, and skin covered them above (Ezek. 37.8). Said R. Jonathan: We cannot learn from the dead of Ezekiel, for what did they resemble? A man who enters a bath; what he takes off first he puts on last. The School of Hillel said: Just as he is formed in this world, so will he be formed in the next world. In this world the skin and flesh came first, the sinews and bones last; so in the future will he begin with the skin and flesh and end with the sinews and bones.¹

The conflict between Hillel and Shammai here reflected is of no concern to us, but what is important for our purposes is the clear reference to Genesis 2.7 in a discussion concerning the resurrection, and further, the consistent polarity of the two aeons, "this world" and "the world to come."

That Genesis 2.7 was quoted in connection with the doctrine of resurrection even earlier than the two famous Pharisaic teachers Hillel and Shammai is shown from 2 Maccabees 7.23, where it is reflected in the speech of the pious mother to her seven sons about to suffer martyrdom:

τοιγαροῦν ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης ὁ πλάσας (cf. Heb. 74''')
 ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν καὶ πάντων ἐξευρῶν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ
 πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσιν μετ' ἐλέους
 ὥς νῦν ὑπεροράτε ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους.²

1. Gen. Rabba 14.5: Soncino, p. 113; Albeck, pp. 128 f.

2. Cf. 4 Macc. 14.5-6, where the brothers are assured of immortality for their souls, rather than resurrection.

Paul's Re-interpretation of Genesis 2.7

It is now possible to see exactly how Paul is arguing in 1 Corinthians 15, and what role the quotation from Genesis 2.7 plays in his argument. His opponents in Corinth, under the influence of teachers who had grown up in Diaspora Judaism, were espousing a doctrine of a-somatic immortality, and denying the bodily resurrection. In stating their case, they were using a current exegesis of Genesis 2.7 to show from Scripture that their view was the correct one. This exegetical tradition stressed the divine, spiritual "inbreathing" in man, by which earthly man participated in the spiritual $\epsilonἰκὼν$ τοῦ θεοῦ (Gen. 1.27).

Paul's use of Genesis 2.7 is entirely polemical,¹ and based on traditions of interpretation which we have seen in connection with Qumran and especially Rabbinic teaching. Paul inserts ὁ πρῶτος . . . Ἀδάμ into the quotation in order to affirm his belief that the Adam of Genesis 2.7 is the only "Adam" in which created man participates, in contrast to the δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος who, for

1. R. Scroggs, in his recent book, The Last Adam (Philadelphia, 1966), pp. 86 ff., has missed the significance of the function of Gen. 2.7 in 1 Cor. 15, for he fails to take into account the polemical situation.

Paul, is Christ (but for the opponents was the earthly man of Genesis 2.7).¹ He reinforces this by means of the parenthesis² in which he stresses, against his opponents, the priority in time of the psychic element in man (i.e. man as the ψυχὴ of Genesis 2.7 in contrast to the πνοὴ ζωῆς) over the πνευματικός element--which man is to possess only in the resurrection, but which the opponents thought constituted man's real immortal self by virtue of the divine "inbreathing." For Paul, man's complete πνευματικός existence, which he describes as τὸ πνευματικὸν σῶμα (15.44), will be given only in the resurrection by the ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ, i.e. Christ, who by virtue of his resurrection has become the πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν.³

1 Corinthians 15.45 is actually an eschatological "targum" on Genesis 2.7. καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς and καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν are transposed; to the latter Paul adds ὁ πρῶτος . . . Ἀδάμ . The former Paul reconstructs on the model

1. Cf. Philo, *Op.* 134: . . . διαφορά παμμεγέθης ἐστὶ τοῦ τε νῦν πλασθέντος ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονότος πρότερον.

2. Following Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, p. 74.

3. Cf. 15.22: ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται.

of the latter; πνοήν ζωῆς becomes πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν; ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν. This reconstruction expresses Paul's dualism of the two ages, the "present age" and the "age to come."

Paul further reinforces his arguments by stressing that the first man, not the second, is ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός,¹ and that the second man, Christ, not the first Adam or any part of him, is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐπουράνιος.² For Paul, man as he is now can in no sense be said to partake of or bear the εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπουρανίου ἀνθρώπου (15.49; cf. Gen. 1.27); man now bears only the image of Adam, the χοϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος, and can become ἐπουράνιος only in the resurrection.³ To "bear the image" means here more than simply to exhibit an external form; εἰκὼν has the connotation of "essential character," and can be understood as equivalent to μορφή.⁴

1. Cf. Philo, Op. 135 ἐκ τε γεώδους οὐσίας; Leg. All. 1.31 ὁ γῆϊνος (ἄνθρωπος).

2. Cf. Philo, Det. 85, where it is stated that the πνεῦμα in man is the θεοειδὲς δημιουργήμα, that which makes man a φυτὸν οὐράνιον. Man is οὐράνιος by virtue of the divine "inbreathing" and his participation thereby in the οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος of Gen. 1.27.

3. Note the importance of the future, φορέσομεν, certainly the original Pauline reading.

4. Cf. Brandenburger, Adam und Christus, p. 147.

Thus Paul can say similarly in Philippians 3.21 that Christ μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

The use of the word σῶμα throughout the passage from vv. 35-46 is deliberate, and belongs to Paul's own argument. The term σῶμα comes neither from the opponents' theology nor, of course, from Genesis 2.7; it is Paul who introduces the term. For Paul a bodiless existence is unthinkable; for him man's individuality is expressed not in terms of ψυχή or πνεῦμα, but in terms of σῶμα.¹ Man in the old aeon and in the new aeon as well is σῶμα. To the opponents' view that a πνευματικός element in man's soul is that which guarantees his continuity after death, Paul must answer that man both in body and soul, as a ψυχικὸν σῶμα, belongs still to the old Adam through whom sin and death came into the world.² Man's full spiritual existence as a πνευματικὸν σῶμα lies in the future with the resurrection; it is an eschatological hope.

Paul must make this eschatological dimension very clear because he is confronted by opponents who regard

1. Cf. Weiss, Korintherbrief, p. 373; also Bultmann, Theology, I, 192 ff.

2. 1 Cor. 15.21-22; Rom. 5.12, 18.

bodily and earthly existence per se as an inferior existence. One can perceive this attitude behind v. 35. Paul's angry outburst ὀργῶν indicates, that although the question is framed in diatribe style some such attitude existed in Corinth, the implication being that anyone who argues for a resurrection of the body is arguing for a continuation of an inferior existence.

It is for this reason, too, that Paul stresses from vv. 35-50 the totally different quality of the resurrection body as opposed to the present body.¹ Paul is ready to admit that bodily existence--he would add, as things are now--is under the grip of mortality and corruption. This is clearly enunciated in v. 50:

This I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor can corruption inherit incorruption.

By the expression "flesh and blood" (a Semitism) Paul means "man as he is now."² Paul's point is that the

1. In this Paul goes beyond the rather naïve view of the "two formations" held by the Pharisees of the schools of Hillel and Shammai. See above, pp. 61-62.

2. J. Jeremias is right in his argument that the sentence, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," does not refer to the resurrection of the dead, but rather to living persons; see Abba, Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 298-307. The

resurrection body (τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον, τὸ σῶμα τὸ πνευματικόν) will be different from the body we now have as a result of our kinship with the first Adam (as Paul understands the matter). For in the resurrection we will share the life given to us by Christ, the second Adam, the πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν who will change our present bodies into new, glorified, "spiritual" bodies.

Summary

We can see at work in our passage a conflict of dualisms. The opponents were operating on a non-eschatological plane in dividing man's present existence into a duality of heavenly-earthly, spiritual-psychic,

second part of the verse refers to the bodies of those who have died before the Parousia. I should like to add, however, that this verse does belong to the discussion begun in v. 35, "What kind of body . . . ?" It functions as the transition from the argument begun in v. 35 to the statement of the "mystery" in vv. 51 ff. (See outline above, pp. 38-39.) The point of the verse is, as Jeremias says (p. 299): "Neither the living nor the dead can take part in the Kingdom of God--as they are." One can see here also a polemic against the view of the opponents that they have inherited the Kingdom already (cf. 1 Cor. 4.8).

incorruptible-corruptible, immortal-mortal, levels.¹ Paul can use the same terminology, but employs it in a completely eschatological fashion, in which a dualism of "the present age" and "the age to come" are the principal factors. For Paul man's existence now is characterized by a ψυχικὸν σῶμα and is marked by φθορά, ἀτιμία, ἀσθένεια etc. That is because man as he is now still belongs to the aeon of sin and death, to the "first Adam." Man's existence in the resurrection, however, will be characterized by a πνευματικὸν σῶμα (= τὸ σῶμα τὸ γερνησόμενον v. 37), to which will belong the attribute of ἀφθαρσία, δόξα, δύναμις, etc. Then man--i.e. man ἐν Χριστῷ --will belong entirely to the new aeon of life, to the Man through whom is the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν (15.21) and who himself as the resurrected one is the ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων (15.20).

Thus, we see that the use of the terms πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός in 1 Corinthians 15 is governed entirely by the polemical situation, involving rival interpretations of Genesis 2.7. Paul's own use of this terminology

1. According to H. Almqvist, Plutarch und das Neue Testament (Uppsala, 1946), p. 104, the antithesis θνητός-ἀθάνατος, φθαρτός-ἀφθαρτός is current in the Stoic diatribe. He refers in this connection to Plutarch, Mor. 960b (De soll. an. 2).

constitutes, as it were, a re-interpretation of the opponents' own terminology. It is for this reason, as we noted above (p. 13), that Paul's use of this terminology is confined to his letter to the Corinthian congregation.

In the following chapter another context in which the same terminology appears is treated. As we have observed with respect to the Hellenistic-Jewish doctrine of immortality, man's higher element must be nurtured by activities and attitudes which are consistent with its nature. The same state of affairs pertains in Paul's Corinthian congregation, where the emphasis is upon σοφία .

Chapter IV

WISDOM AND THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ IN 1 CORINTHIANS 2

Introduction

The key passage in this study is 1 Corinthians 2.6-16, which in turn belongs to a larger context running from 1.10 to 4.21. This whole passage is an answer to the problem of the Corinthian factions and an apologia for Paul's own apostolic office and authority.¹

Not the least of the problems in interpreting 2.6 ff. is the fact that in 2.1-5 Paul seems to disclaim any "wisdom" for himself, placing σοφία ἀνθρώπων in contrast to the δύναμις θεοῦ.² But then in 2.6 Paul

1. See N. Dahl, NTT 54, pp. 1-23 and especially p. 11; see also R. Funk, Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God (New York, 1966), pp. 277 ff.

2. Which for Paul is nothing other than Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐσταυρωμένος (2.2); cf. 1.24, however, where Χριστός ἐσταυρωμένος is both the δύναμις θεοῦ and the σοφία θεοῦ.

says, σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις

Is Paul contradicting himself? At first glance it seems so, but it is important to note that in this passage he is making a point which is crucial for an understanding not only of Paul's idea of what σοφία is, but also for an insight into the wisdom theology of his opponents. The argumentation is as follows: I did not preach wisdom, . . . but I have wisdom I can preach to the τελειοι. The structure of this argument can be found elsewhere in Paul's letters, as e.g. in 2 Corinthians 12.18 ff. and Philippians 3.3.¹ Furthermore, Paul's disclaimer to σοφία in 1.8 ff. must be regarded as hyperbolic, for in fact he is himself using "wisdom" tradition in his argumentation!² So Paul does present "wisdom" in 2.6 ff., and does so in a very striking manner: he presents his "wisdom" using the opponents' terminology and turning it

1. 2. Cor. 12.18 ff.: ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ γὰρ καυχῆσομαι Phil. 3.3: καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποθότες, καίπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων πεποιθήσιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί

2. This point is made by H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," NTS 12 (1965/6), 234 ff. Cf. also A. Feuillet, "Les 'chefs de ce siècle' et la Sagesse divine d'après 1 Cor. 2, 6-8," SPCIC I, 384 ff., where numerous contacts between 1 Cor. 1-2 and Baruch 3.9-4.4 are pointed out.

back against them. In doing so the terminology of the opponents remains, thus enabling us to reconstruct their arguments, but the essence and content of the "wisdom" is Paul's own.

The Τέλαιοι and the Νήπιοι

The use of the term τέλειος in 2.6 is a polemical one, as is shown by 3.1 ff.¹ The opponents in Corinth had claimed to be τέλειοι, and the context of the passage shows that they made this claim on the basis of their σοφία. There were undoubtedly some in Corinth who claimed to be a spiritual elite (οἱ τέλειοι = οἱ πνευματικοί), over against those who had not yet arrived, the νήπιοι. How is this claim to be interpreted?

1. For Paul himself, τελειότης belongs to God (Rom. 12.2 θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . τέλειον), and will belong to man only in the eschatological future (1 Cor. 13.10; cf. Phil. 3.12 οὐκ . . . ἤδη τετελείωμαι), though Christian "perfection" is to be striven for (Phil. 3.15; 1 Cor. 14.20, both of these passages reflecting opponents' usage, however). Paul nowhere else makes a distinction between the τέλειοι, who are capable of higher wisdom, and the νήπιοι, who are able to receive only elementary instruction. But cf. Heb. 5.14, reflecting a provenance similar to that of the Corinthian opponents.

First of all, the τέλειος-νήπιος contrast which Paul wrests from his opponents must be placed into a contextual background. It has been frequently suggested that this terminology is taken from the context of the Hellenistic mystery-religions.¹ But this view cannot be sustained, simply because the term τέλειος is not the usual term used for one who has been initiated into the mysteries. In "mystery" terminology, the initiate is referred to as τετελεσμένος, or τελεσθείς, or τελούμενος.² The "mystery" terminology had, since Plato, been used metaphorically in philosophical or theological discourse.³ Philo uses "mystery" terminology in a number of places in his writings.⁴

1. Most recently, D. Luhrmann, Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden (WMANT 16; Neukirchen, 1965), p. 113; cf. Wilckens, Weisheit, pp. 53 ff.; and Reitzenstein, Mysterienreligionen, pp. 338 ff.

2. Cf. already J. Weiss, Korintherbrief, p. 74; M. Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus (Göttingen, 1909), p. 88; and now G. Wagner, Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem von Römer 6,1-11 (ATANT 39; Zürich, 1962), p. 287. The latter takes up in detail the problem of the possible influences of the Mysteries on the religion of the N. T. On this see also A. D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background (New York, 1964), pp. 109 ff.

3. Cf. e.g. Plato, Symp 210A ff., Diotima's revelation concerning the nature of ἔρως.

4. See especially Cherub. 48-49, where the following "mystery" terms appear: μύστης, ἱερά μυστήρια, ἀμύητος, τετελεσμένος, τελετή, μνηθείς, τὰ μέγαλα μυστήρια, ἱεροφάντης,

In the "mystery" passages, however, the terms τέλειος-νήπιος do not occur. The opposite of a τέτελεσμένος is not νήπιος, but ἀμύητος.

The τέλειος-νήπιος contrast is to be placed in the larger context of Hellenistic philosophical paraenetic usage--particularly that of Stoicism.¹ The immediate background of the use of this terminology by the Corinthian opponents of Paul is Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism, as represented particularly by Philo.

The meaning of τέλειος is enlarged by Philo from its secular usage in Stoicism to denote one who has achieved the highest religious attainments, including especially "wisdom." The metaphor is that of "adulthood," over against "infancy," and wherever Philo uses this τέλειος-νήπιος terminology, there is no "mystery" terminology

etc.; cf. also Leg. All. 3.100 and Sacr. 62. In Clement of Alexandria, see Protr. 12.92-93 (LCL), where Christ is referred to as a ἱεροφάντης.

1. Cf. Weiss, Korintherbrief, p. 74; and Delling in TWBNT, VIII, 70 ff. For a full-scale treatment of the term τέλειος, see P. J. du Plessis, TEΛΕΙΟΣ The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament (Kampen, 1959); his treatment of 1 Cor. 2.6 (pp. 178 ff.), however, I do not find entirely convincing.

at all in the context.¹

For example, commenting allegorically on Genesis 12.1 (Migr. Abr 46), Philo says that one "place" is for νήπιοι, another place for τέλειοι. The former is ἄσκησις, and the latter is called σοφία. Again, (at Migr. Abr. 28 f.), Philo says,

. . . but you must become a migrant, journeying to your fatherland, the land of the holy Word, the father, as it were, of those who are in training (τῶν ἀσκητῶν). That land is Wisdom (ἡ δ' ἐστὶ σοφία), fairest abode of virtue-loving souls. In this place there is for you the self-taught, self-learning nature, free from the milk-fed diet of infancy.

We note here that the idea of perfection, maturity, is tied to the achievement of σοφία. Those who have achieved wisdom have changed abodes, and have arrived at a higher, heavenly plane of existence, to become a γένος both αὐτομαθές and αὐτοδίδακτον.² In contrast there are the νήπιοι, who still need to be fed γαλακτώδης τροφή.

1. Cf. the purely non-metaphorical usage in Spec. Leg. 2.32 where, commenting on Lev. 27.2-8, Philo refers to the Law's distinctions between men and women and between children and adults (νήπιους τελείων) in the matter of payments for vows.

2. αὐτοδίδακτος and αὐτομαθής are attributes of σοφία. Cf. Post. Cain 78; Sac. 79; etc.

This passage sheds much light on the notions of the Corinthian pneumatics whose tenets Paul combats in 1 Corinthians. For them, too, σοφία was reserved for the τέλειοι, whereas the νηπίοι still needed to be fed with elementary instruction, under the metaphor of γάλα (1 Cor. 3.1-2).¹ It is a likely conjecture that Paul's emphasis on the cross of Christ would have been regarded by the Corinthian pneumatics as part of the γάλα, necessary for the "babes" in the congregation, but outgrown by the τέλειοι.

Further light on the theology of the Corinthian opponents is afforded by Philo (in Leg. All. 1.90 ff.) where he speculates on the meaning of Genesis 2.16-17, the command of God addressed to Adam. Philo says that this command was addressed to the πλαστικός ἄνθρωπος, the man who was moulded from the earth. In contrast, Philo says that the mind which was created κατ' εἰκόνα is not the earthly, but heavenly (οὐ γηῖνος, ἀλλ' οὐράνιος). He then proceeds to draw a distinction between three different kinds of men: the φαῦλος, for whom ἀπαγόρευσις and πρόσταξις are

1. Of course, this is Paul speaking to the Corinthians, but he is engaging here in an ironic use of the opponents' own language.

necessary, the neutral (μέσος) or νήπιος, who has need of παραίνεσις and διδασκαλία, but

to the perfect man, created according to the image (τῷ μὲν οὖν τελείῳ τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα) there is no need to give injunctions or prohibitions or exhortations, for the perfect man has need of none of these things (1.94).

Similarly, in his discussion of "soul-agriculture" (ψυχῆς γεωργικῇ , in Agr. 8f.), Philo remarks that its aims are to sow and plant such things as are likely to bear fruit to man, the ruler of nature.

But who else might the man that is in each of us be except the mind (νοῦς), who is accustomed to reaping the benefits from the things sown or planted? But since milk is food for babes, and wheat-cakes for grown men, there is also milky nourishment for the soul suitable for the time of childhood in the form of elementary education; and there is nourishment suitable for the grown men in the form of guidance through wisdom and moderation and all virtue.

Here, again, γάλα is for the νήπιοι, solid food for the τέλειοι who live on the higher plane of life according to the propensities of the νοῦς within man, which Philo calls the ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν (Agr. 9) and the ἄνθρωπος τέλειος ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα (Leg. All. 1.94).¹

1. Cf. Chapter Three and the discussion there of the Philonic exegesis of Gen. 2.7 and 1.27. See also below

One more text I adduce from Philo for the illumination of the τέλειος terminology in 1 Corinthians 2.

Philo comments (in Leg. All. 3.196) on Numbers 28.2 and the two terms τὰ δῶρά μου and δόματα μου in the LXX text as follows:

. . . 'gifts' differ from 'grants' (δῶρα δομάτων διαφέρει). For δῶρα emphasizes the magnitude of perfect goods which God bestows upon the perfect (τελείων ἀγαθῶν . . . ἃ τοῖς τελείοις χαρίζεται ὁ θεός); δόματα are relegated to a much smaller compass, denoting the things of which those naturally suited men who are practising and making progress partake (ὧν μετέχουσιν οἱ εὐφρυνεῖς ἀσκηταὶ οἱ προκόπτοντες).

In this passage the τέλειοι are distinguished not from the νήπιοι, but from those who are progressing toward τελειότης, the προκόπτοντες.¹ Especially interesting,

for the implications of this exegesis for an interpretation of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology in 1 Cor. 2.

1. The language, as noted before, is common to the terminology of Hellenistic philosophy, especially Stoicism. Cf. especially Epictetus in Diss. 1.4 (περὶ προκοπῆς). 4: ἀεὶ γὰρ πρὸς ὃ ἂν ἡ τελειότης τινὸς καθάπται ἄγῃ, πρὸς αὐτὸ ἡ προκοπὴ συνεγγισμός ἐστιν. Paul, though he eschews the application of τελειότης to himself, or to anyone short of the eschatological future, uses the terms προκοπή and προκόπτω to describe his own life (Gal. 1.14) and the life of the Christians in Philippi who stand to benefit from his continued work among them (Phil. 1.25); and in Phil. 1.12 he uses the term προκοπή for the advance of the Gospel.

however, is the clause, τελείων ἀγαθῶν ἃ τοῖς
τελείοις χαρίζεται ὁ θεός, when it is compared with
1 Cor. 2.9-12:

. . . ἃ ὁφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν κτλ. . . . τὰ ὑπὸ
τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν.¹

These texts from Philo provide us with ample
background for an understanding of the Corinthian
opponents' use of the τέλειος terminology and its context
in a claim to a spiritual σοφία. There is in Philo's
usage a mystical-religious quality which lends to the term
σοφία far more than a merely conventional, philosophical
connotation. One who had attained to "wisdom" was already
abiding in a higher level of existence, and as τέλειος
was the recipient of τέλεια ἀγαθά from the beneficence of
God.² Such ideas of σοφία one can confidently attribute
to the Corinthian opponents. It is at any rate clear that
Paul was not addressing a group of self-styled philosophers
or rhetoricians, or even polemicizing against "Greek
wisdom," i.e. philosophy.³ When Paul attacks his opponents'

1. See further on 1 Cor. 2.9 below, pp. 94 ff.

2. See especially Migr. Abr. 28 f. and Leg. All.
3.196 quoted above.

3. Against J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind,
trans. F. Clarke (Richmond, 1959), pp. 148 ff. Cf.

"wisdom" as a σοφία ἀνθρώπων, he is engaging in polemics, on the basis of the conduct exemplified by the "wise" and "perfect" within the community.¹

It remains now to investigate further the whole passage, 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff., and to determine if possible what form this σοφία took for the Corinthian τέλειοι and what was its content.

Σοφία as Content, Previous Positions

The crucial question here is: How much of 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. should be attributed to the opponents of Paul, and how much to Paul himself?

It has most recently been argued that little or nothing of the content of the opponents' wisdom can be seen in this passage, or even in the whole context in

literature cited by Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 1. Wilckens is quite right in his critique of this position. See also N. Dahl in NTT 54, p. 9; and H. Koester, Gnomon 33, p. 590.

1. This is clear from 3.1 ff., and the boasting in which they engaged as though their "wisdom" were their own achievement (3.18-21; and 4.7 f.).

chapters 1-4.¹ On the other hand, Wilckens has argued that 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. reflects the theology of the ("gnostic") opponents, which Paul refutes in 3.1 ff.² Both positions seem to me to miss the mark, in that (1) one can see active in the passage the opponents' terminology, and glimpses of their wisdom theology, but (2) Paul is in this passage also expressing his own views.

Wilckens sees in the use of the plural λαλοῦμεν in 2.6 evidence that this passage is not to be taken as reflecting Paul's own view.³ This view of the matter is improbable, and Scroggs is correct in his opinion that Paul's argumentation would have been in such a case "completely incoherent to the Corinthians."⁴ That Paul would

1. R. Scroggs, "Paul: Σοφός and Πνευματικός," NTS 14 (1967/8), 33-55; see especially p. 34. In a footnote on p. 34, Scroggs says, "The difficult problem of the opponents' views cannot be discussed here, but a fresh analysis is pressingly needed." One can hardly help but wonder how this analysis can be carried out if the text itself is seen in advance as not providing information on this problem.

2. Weisheit, pp. 52-96.

3. Ibid., p. 52, n. 1. He also reads κηρύσσομεν in 1.23 as referring to "we Christians." κηρύσσομεν in 1.23 is formally parallel to λαλοῦμεν in 2.6. On the use of the plural see below.

4. NTS 14, p. 33.

so completely be governed in this passage by the theology of the opponents, without attempting at the same time to refute this theology, is most unlikely. What is decisive in this passage is that Paul is dependent upon the opponents' terminology, but uses this terminology to express his own radically different theological point of view.¹

Yet it is equally clear that his opponents' theology is reflected in this section, albeit in a form already modified by Paul's own emphases for the purpose of showing his opponents how far he can accommodate his own intentions to their language and further, what the consequences of their manner of speaking would be, i.e. that though Paul can speak σοφία to the τέλειοι, he cannot yet speak σοφία to them, for they are still νήπιοι as regards their behavior in the congregation (3.1 ff.)!²

1. See now Funk's perceptive study, Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God, especially pp. 289 ff.

2. Others who have seen in 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. an amalgamation of the opponents' theology with Paul's own emphases are R. Bultmann, TDNT I, 709, also Glauben und Verstehen (Tübingen, 1933), pp. 42-44; G. Bornkamm, TWBNT IV, 825 ff.; and E. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in der Evangelien (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 53; Lund, 1955), pp. 20 ff.

Decisive against Wilckens' thesis is the form of

2.6: σοφίαν δέ λαλοῦμεν . . . σοφίαν δέ οὐ¹

Paul is here speaking of a wisdom which, on the basis of content, he contrasts with that of his opponents whose σοφία Paul contemptuously refers to as σοφία ἀνθρώπων and a σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. As will be shown presently, the content of Paul's version of the σοφία of God is nothing else than the salvatory crucifixion of Christ as the center of God's salvific plan (2.8).²

D. Luhrmann has recently studied the form of 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. and has tried to show that Paul is here taking over a piece of his opponents' esoteric preaching and is emending it, mainly by means of additions, to conform more to his own theology.³ According to Luhrmann, the opponents were using a Revelationsschema such as occurs also in some deutero-Pauline passages,⁴ a

1. See now also Funk, Language, p. 291. Paul's use of the first person plural where he simply means ἐγώ is well-known and frequent in his letters. For a standard discussion see Stauffer in TDNT IV, 356 ff. For a striking example, see 1 Thess. 2.18: ἠθελήσαμεν . . . ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος.

2. See below, p. 92.

3. Offenbarungsverständnis, especially pp. 114 ff.

4. Col. 1.26 f.; Eph. 3.4 f., 9 f.; Rom. 16.25 f. Luhrmann bases his study on an article by Nils Dahl,

form of preaching characterized by the contrast, "previously hidden/ now revealed," and which, according to Luhrmann, cannot be ascribed to Paul himself.¹

There are at least two reasons why Luhrmann cannot be followed completely. First, in the details of his argument he seems to be assuming that this preaching schema can be treated as a Vorlage arrived at by adding certain elements to the text and subtracting others from it.² But if it be granted that a preaching form is behind 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. (which is certainly possible), it must nevertheless be recognized that we are not confronted

"Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (BZNW 21; Berlin, 1954), pp. 3-9.

1. "Wenn es richtig ist, dass Paulus in diesem Abschnitt seine Gegner, die korinthischen Gnostiker, zitiert, lässt sich vermuten, dass ihm bei ihnen auch das Revelationsschema in der festen Form, wie wir es in der späteren Tradition gefunden haben, vorgelegen hat. Er hat es dann korrigiert." See Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 133.

2. Luhrmann's version of the original form of 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. and Paul's corrections are presented on pp. 134 ff. For example, he thinks that after 1 Cor. 2.8a the original form had $\nu\upsilon\nu\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$, which Paul changes in v. 10, further inserting the statement on the crucifixion of the "Lord of Glory" and the citation in v. 9.

here with a fixed piece of oral tradition such as a hymn or a creed, and certainly not with a literary piece which Paul would have at his disposal to emend critically.¹

Secondly, the preaching form posited here was undoubtedly one of the most common forms of preaching in the primitive church.² It is quite arbitrary to take this preaching form which is rooted in Jewish Apocalyptic³ and apply it to "gnostic" opponents of Paul in Corinth.⁴ The form of 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. must rather be ascribed to Paul, who in turn is merely employing an apocalyptic type of preaching form common in the primitive church from its

1. For a possible example of the latter, see Georgi, Gegner, pp. 274-282, on 2 Cor. 3.7-18.

2. This has been shown by Nils Dahl's careful study cited above, and also by E. Sjöberg, verborgene Menschensohn, pp. 1 ff.

3. Sjöberg, loc. cit.

4. See H. Conzelmann's critique of Luhrmann's position, NTS 12, p. 239. Conzelmann argues against a "vorpaulinischen Belege," asserting that "vielmehr sehen wir es in I Kor. 2.6ff. in statu nascendi." Further, he states, "Die Aufnahme durch die Gnosis ist sekundär. Das Schema ist nicht an sich gnostisch sondern: es kann leicht im Sinne der Gnosis verwendet werden" (p. 239, n. 6). For an interesting example of a gnostic use of this form, see Evangelium Veritatis 18.10 ff., a passage on which I hope to publish a brief study in the near future.

very beginnings. That Paul here states that this "wisdom" is reserved for the τέλειοι is pure irony, for in fact Paul elsewhere stresses that the secrets of God's salvific plan belong to the entire congregation of the elect.¹

What, then, was the σοφία against which Paul polemicizes? And how did this σοφία serve to make the Corinthians τέλειοι and πνευματικοί? A Hellenistic-Jewish background has already been posited for the terminology in which their ideas were formulated, but one must go beyond this background for the content of the Corinthians' "wisdom," for, after all, they were Corinthians. Although it is not possible to discern through 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. the entire content of what for the opponents constituted σοφία, Paul gives us enough clues in the way he reformulates the opponents' claims for us to discern some of the constituent elements. I would posit in this connection the use of the Christological title κύριος τῆς δόξης² along with the context in which the phrase εἰς

1. See above all 2 Cor. 4.3 f. Of course, the notion of "perfection" occurs also in apocalyptic, the background that is assumed for Paul. For a good study of the idea of "perfection" in Qumran, for example, see Du Plessis, ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ , pp. 104-115.

2. I agree with Luhrmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 137, that this title was used by Paul's opponents.

δόξαν ἡμῶν occurs, and the use of the quotation in 2.9a.

Σοφία as Content, κύριος τῆς δόξης

The title κύριος τῆς δόξης is an unusual one in that it occurs in the New Testament only here and in James 2.1. It is essentially a divine appellation, and though it does not occur in the LXX in precisely the same form,¹ it does occur in 1 Enoch several times both in the Greek and in the Ethiopic versions.² Especially significant are the occurrences of the title in the Similitudes of 1 Enoch. In 40.3 it appears in the context of a vision

1. The phrase δόξα κυρίου is found throughout the LXX. Ps. 23.7-10 is an important text, in that the title ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης is juxtaposed with κύριος (= ,71,7").

2. E.g. in 1 Enoch 22.14 Enoch responds to a vision with praises to God: τότε ἠύλόγησα τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης (Eth: 'egzi'a sebhat), καὶ εἶπα, Εὐλογητὸς εἶ, κύριε Again, in 1 Enoch 25.3 God is called "the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King" (Eth., but Gr. has ὁ ἅγιος τῆς δόξης instead of ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης). The title "Lord of Glory" occurs also in 1 Enoch 27.3,5; 36.4; 40.3; 63.2; and 83.8. For the Greek and Ethiopic texts I have used the editions of R. H. Charles, The Book of Enoch (Oxford, 1912), and The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series XI; Oxford, 1906).

of the heavenly throne and the praises of the angelic attendants who "were uttering praises before the Lord of glory" ('enza yesebehu qedem 'egzi'a sebhat). In 63.2 God is called "the Lord of glory and the Lord of wisdom" ('egzi'a sebhat wa'egzi'a tebab). These texts may shed some light on the Corinthians' experiences of "glory" in their claim to "wisdom," and in their claim to speaking the "language of the angels."¹

In 1 Corinthians 2.8, however (as well as in James 2.1), this title is applied to Christ.² The theological context out of which an understanding of Christ as κύριος τῆς δόξης arises is the primitive Hellenistic-

1. See 1 Cor. 13.1, and the discussion of 1 Cor. 12-14 in Chapter Five.

2. As a Christological title it is quite rare even outside of the N. T. In Barnabas 21.9 it is not clear whether it refers to God or to Christ: ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν. In Justin Martyr, Dial. 29.1, the related title βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης (Ps. 23.7-10 LXX) is applied to Jesus: Δοξάσωμεν τὸν θεόν, ἅμα τὰ ἔθνη συνελθόντα, ὅτι καὶ ὑμᾶς ἐπεσκέψατο· δοξάσωμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς δόξης, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων. See also Dial. 85.1 and 127.5. In the Ascension of Isaiah 9.32, Christ is referred to as "the Lord of all glories" ('egzi' zak^wellu sebhat); the context is especially interesting for it describes a vision of Isaiah in the seventh heaven, surrounded by angels, glory, etc. This is not far from the mystical concerns of the Corinthian opponents.

Jewish-Christian confession of Jesus as the exalted one. The most important witness to this pre-Pauline confession is Philippians 2.9-11, a hymnic passage describing the exaltation of Jesus and the bestowal upon him of the divine name.¹ D. Georgi has recently laid bare the religions-geschichtliche background of this hymn,² and I find his arguments convincing. I would venture to apply the Christology underlying the hymn in Philippians 2 to the church in Corinth as well.³ The error of the Corinthians was not the Christology itself, but the conclusions they were drawing from it vis-à-vis their own existence and self-understanding. They were applying the exalted state of Christ to themselves, εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν.

The way in which Paul uses the title κύριος τῆς δόξης in 1 Corinthians 2.8 shows that he is interested in applying another criterion to the life of the community

1. See also Heb. 1.2 ff.

2. In Zeit und Geschichte, pp. 263-293.

3. Paul, of course, shares this Christology, coupling it with an affirmation of Christ's resurrection, and thus placing it in a historical and eschatological perspective. See above, p. 41.

rather than the δόξα of the exalted Lord; namely, the cross of Christ. For the Corinthian τέλειοι, in their "wisdom" concerning the exalted identity of Jesus Christ as κύριος τῆς δόξης, were placing their own experiences in the community under the banner of the δόξα of Christ, and were in danger of distinguishing their higher Christological insights from the kerygma of the cross. Hence Paul's concern lest the Corinthian claim to wisdom result in the "emptying" of the cross of Christ (1.17). Hence his ironical statement in 4.8: ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ· ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε· χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε.¹ Hence, also, his affirmation of the crucifixion of the κύριος τῆς δόξης. Indeed, Paul claims that the higher insight is in fact nothing else than the understanding of the cross, and not

1. "That the Corinthians understood sophia as bringing salvation into the present there can be no doubt (cf. 4.8)," is Funk's statement of the case; see Language, p. 290. The background for such a belief can be seen in Wis. Sol. 8.17 et passim, where participation in wisdom guarantees immortality and salvation. A striking parallel to 4.8 is found in Philo's description of the Therapeutae Vit. Cont. 13: διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ μακαρίας ζωῆς ἕμερον τετελευτηκέναι νομίζοντες ἤδη τὸν θνητὸν βίον κτλ. Here is where the self-understanding of the Corinthian opponents can be said to be similar to that of those who argued that ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι (2 Tim. 2.18). Of course the Philo passage may mean nothing more than a legal decision whereby the Therapeutae consign their estates to their heirs ahead of time. This is suggested by the context; see especially the unusual use of the word, προκληρονομούμενοι.

a speculation that is concerned with wisdom beyond the kerygma of the cross.

The background of Paul's argumentation is Jewish apocalyptic.¹ He understands the crucifixion of Christ as the center of a mystery belonging to God's redemptive plan. This plan none of the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου knew, for if they had known this mysterious σοφία they would not have crucified the "Lord of glory," thus bringing defeat upon themselves and opening the way of salvation to God's elect.

The ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου are demonic powers, understood by Paul as standing behind the human, political rulers of the world.² Paul does not say that

1. The Jewish-apocalyptic background of Paul's use of μυστήριον and σοφία is explored by Bornkamm in TWBNT IV, 821 ff.; on 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. see pp. 825 f. See also Anton Fridrichsen, "Gnosis. Et Bidrag til Belysning av den Paulinske Terminologie og Erkjennelsesteori," in Religionshistoriska Studier Tillägnade Edvard Lehmann (Lund, 1927), pp. 85-109, especially p. 92.

2. The Jewish-apocalyptic background of the term οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου has been thoroughly discussed by M. Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus (Göttingen, 1909), pp. 90 ff. For further background material from Qumran see now D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," Scripta Hierosolymitana IV, 218 ff. The argument of Feuillet, in SPCIC I, 384-389, that the ἄρχοντες are Jewish and pagan rulers, I find unconvincing.

the ἄρχοντες did not recognize the Lord of glory and therefore accidentally crucified him.¹ The ἥν in 2.8 clearly precludes this, for the relative pronoun refers not to the "Lord of glory"² but to the hidden plan of God, σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, by which the "Lord of glory" was to be crucified in order thereby to defeat the demonic powers and redeem the elect.³ According to Paul, the ἄρχοντες crucified the "Lord of glory" knowing full well who he was; what they did not know was God's salvific plan.

Paul has thus taken an enthusiastic Christological affirmation of the opponents, "Lord of glory," and has emphasized that the decisive point is his crucifixion. The implication of this for the Christian life in the

1. This version appears in Asc. Is. 11.19 ff.; cf. also Epistula Apostolorum 13.

2. Contra Wilckens, Weisheit, pp. 71 ff. He equates the "Lord of glory" with a personified Sophia. See the criticism of Funk, Language, pp. 292, 295, who stresses that what is hidden from the powers and from the "un-initiated" is the mystery of the cross. Cf. also Hegermann, Schöpfungsmittler, pp. 119 f.; and Luhrmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 137.

3. Cf. 1 Cor. 4.1, where Paul refers to himself (though the plural is used) as a "steward of the mysteries." On this see J. Reumann, "Οἰκονομία - Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte," NTS 13 (1966/7), 160.

present is that the cross of Christ is the decisive factor now, and the glory is promised for the future (cf. 1 Cor. 15.43; Phil. 3.21; Rom. 5.2, 8.18; etc.). Two different ways of understanding the Christian existence are in evidence, the one characterized by eschatological tension (Paul), the other characterized by a type of mysticism (the opponents). This becomes even clearer in 1 Corinthians 2.9 ff.

Σοφία as Content, 1 Corinthians 2.9

I am inclined to agree with Wilckens¹ that Paul's use of the apocryphal quotation in 1 Corinthians 2.9 reflects a use of this same quotation on the part of his opponents.² It is probable that part of what constituted for them σοφία was a mystical vision of

ὃ ὁφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδον καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν
καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη.³

1. Weisheit, p. 80.

2. Luhrmann, on the other hand, attributes its use to Paul himself who, according to Luhrmann, inserts it into the opponents' Revelationsschema; cf. Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 139.

3. ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν seems to me, on the other hand, to be a Pauline addition. See below, p. 98 ff.

The content of the δ remains unspecified, and Wilckens goes beyond the evidence when he makes it refer to the gnostic redeemer-myth.¹ Even in the "gnostic" materials he cites where the quotation occurs,² there is no reference at all to the "redeemer-myth," but only to a knowledge of, or visions of, or promises of, heavenly realities. There is nothing inherently "gnostic" about this quotation. As Conzelmann has recently pointed out,

An sich ist es weder apokalyptisch noch gnostisch. Es stellt einfach Verborgenheit und übernatürlichen Einblick fest. Dass kann natürlich leicht sowohl von Apokalyptik als Gnosis aufgenommen werden.³

The quotation is widespread, and occurs in divergent types of material, not only in "gnostischen

1. Weisheit, p. 80.

2. These include the Baruch of "Justin," Hippolyt. Ref. 5.23.3; 5.24.1; 5.26.16 f.; Acta Thom. 36; Actus Petri cum Simone 39; Asc. Is. 11 (Lat.); see Weisheit, pp. 76-80. The passage from the Mandaean Qolastā is a doubtful witness to our text, at best (p. 79). The Manichaean Turfan fragment (p. 79) bears a striking resemblance to Log. 17 of the Gospel of Thomas in that it ascribes the saying to the Redeemer and contains an extra member, " . . . und nicht ergriffen mit der Hand"; cf. Thomas, Log. 17: . . . $\delta\lambda\omega\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \mu\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota\delta\ \sigma\mu\sigma\omega\mu\eta$.

3. NTS 12, pp. 239 f.

Kreisen."¹ If an analysis of the various contexts in which the citation occurs is carried out, one discovers that two main types stand out: a type which I would call "mystical," in which the content of what is hidden to mortal eyes and ears is of heavenly realities divulged only to a mystical elite. The other type is "eschatological," in which the content of what is hidden to mortal eyes and ears is promised for future revelation. Of course, these two contexts can overlap insofar as the speaker implicitly claims that he has been privy to at least part of what yet remains to be revealed in its fulness in the eschatological future.²

The origin of this quotation is obscure, and I cannot go into this question here.³ It is clearly poetic

1. Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 80. For example, in addition to the texts referred to in the previous note, one can adduce: 1 Clem. 34.8; 2 Clem. 11.7; Clem. Alex. Protr. 10.76 (LCL), Protr. 12.91 (LCL), and Quis dives 23.949 (LCL); Apostolic Constitutions 7.32.

2. As Paul does in v. 10: $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\epsilon\nu\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ including in the content of $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ as its main point the eschatological significance of the cross of Christ in the salvatory plan of God.

3. The latest contributions to this question are P. Prigent, "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor 2,9," ThZ 14 (1958), 416-429; and M. Philonenko, "Quod oculus non vidit, 1 Cor. 2,9," ThZ 14 (1958), 51-52.

in style,¹ and may originate in a Jewish liturgy.² One thing is certain: Whether or not the quotation is a construct based on Is. 64.4 (LXX 64.3), as Jerome thought, or a passage quoted from an "Apocalypse of Elijah," as was Origen's opinion,³ the quotation is not a construct composed by Paul,⁴ but was already to hand when Paul used it. This is shown by the occurrence of the quotation (i.e. the first part of it = 1 Cor. 2.9a) in a first-century Jewish work which cannot have been influenced by Paul. In pseudo-Philo, Biblical Antiquities 26.13, there occurs the following sentence:

. . . et tunc accipiam et istos et alios plures valde meliores, ex eo quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit, et in cor hominis non ascendit, quousque fieret tale aliquid in seculo . . .⁵

1. Dibelius, Geisterwelt, p. 91.

2. Prigent, ThZ 14, pp. 426-428.

3. Cf. Prigent, ThZ 14, pp. 421-424; and Wilckens, Weisheit, pp. 75 f.

4. Against Oepke, TWBNT III, 991 f. Haenchen is probably wrong in deriving the quotation in Justin's Baruch from Paul; see "Das Buch Baruch," ZTK 50 (1953), 139.

5. G. Kisch (ed.), Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (Publications in Medieval Studies, University of Notre Dame 10; Notre Dame, Indiana, 1949), referred to by Philonenko, ThZ 14, p. 51. Italics are mine. Philonenko also sees in the phrase "quantum bonum fecit Deus hominibus" in 26.14 a trace of a formula analogous to the second part of the Pauline citation.

It seems safe to posit that the "wisdom" of the Corinthian τέλειοι included such things as the identity of the exalted Christ as ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης, as well as the heavenly surroundings of the Lord of glory--such things as no mortal eye had been permitted to see, no ear to hear, nor have ever entered the mind of man.¹ The glory of the κύριος τῆς δόξης and his exalted heavenly state the Corinthians were eagerly claiming for themselves, not willing to wait for the glory which Paul insisted was yet to come.² This emphasis on the futuristic aspect of glory--the eschatological tension which characterizes Paul's own theology--seems to me to be expressed in the last part of the citation in 2.9: ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. That is not to say, of course, that Paul composed this part and added it.³ But what makes

1. Of course, Paul himself is no stranger to such mystical concerns, as witness 2 Cor. 12 and the ὄρητα ῥήματα which he claims to have heard (v. 4). Bousset was correct in comparing 1 Cor. 2 with 2 Cor. 12; see Die Himmelsreise der Seele (Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 4 [1901], 136-169 and 229-273; r.p. Darmstadt, 1960), pp. 13-15. The crucial point is, however, that Paul did not regard these experiences as of central concern in his Christian faith and understanding of existence.

2. See above, p.94 , and passages cited.

3. 1 Clem. 34.8 is against this, as is Acta Thom. 36 and Clem. Alex. Quis Dives 23.949 (LCL). Of course the

this appear to be an addition to 2.9a is the redundant occurrence of ὅσα.¹ Paul is saying, in effect, that the heavenly things which eye has not seen, etc., are not a present possession and do not characterize our life now, as though they could be conjured up in a mystical experience.² They are ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεός for the future possession of those who love him.³

first part of the quotation can be used eschatologically, as in Clem Alex. Protr. 10.76 (LCL): ἡ γραφή εἰκότως εὐαγγελίζεται τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν· οἱ δὲ ἅγιοι κυρίου κληρονομήσουσι τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ . . . ἦν ὁφθαλμός κτλ. Cf. also Apostolic Constitutions 7.32. Likewise, the second part of the quotation can be used "mystically," as in Quis dives 23.949 (LCL).

1. Nestle text, BApC; ἃ in P⁴⁶~~XX~~DGplC1.

2. Erik Peterson has conjectured that Paul is using the quotation in a polemic against Jewish mystics in Corinth; see "1 Kor. 1,18f. und die Thematik des jüdischen Busstages," in Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis, pp. 48 f. Cf. also E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis," in Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume II (Jerusalem, 1965), pp. 799 f.

3. There may be in this an implicit polemic against an idea such as is expressed in Wis. Sol. 6.12: λαμπρά καὶ ἀμάραντος ἐστὶν ἡ σοφία καὶ εὐχερῶς θεωρεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγαπώντων αὐτήν Note also that in Thomas 17, the last part of the quotation is missing, another indication that Paul is adding this to a form of the quotation used by his opponents. The use of this quotation in Thomas and by the opponents is probably very similar.

Σοφία as Πνεῦμα

It is clear from the foregoing that σοφία was regarded by the Corinthian opponents and by Paul as basically a content. But there remains the possibility that σοφία was also regarded as a semi-hypostatic existence or personification.

While it is impossible for me to agree with Wilckens in his identification of hypostatized Wisdom with the κύριος τῆς δόξης,¹ it is probable that the Corinthian opponents held to a semi-hypostatic Wisdom-figure which they identified with the Holy Spirit.²

There is ample background for this identification in Hellenistic Judaism. For example, in The Wisdom of Solomon σοφία is called a φιλόανθρωπον πνεῦμα (1.6) and a πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον (7.22).³ In The Wisdom of Solomon

1. For criticisms, see in addition to the literature cited in n. 2, p. 93, Koester's review in Gnomon 33, p. 593; Schmithals, Gnosis, pp. 130 ff.; and Conzelmann, NTS 12, p. 237. Actually, Paul comes closer to equating σοφία with Christ than do the opponents, as Koester points out (loc. cit.).

2. Wilckens also identifies σοφία with πνεῦμα, Weisheit, p. 81; cf. p. 92 where he says Paul also identifies πνεῦμα with the exalted Lord, citing 2 Cor. 3.17 as proof. So, according to Wilckens, in 1 Cor. 2 σοφία = κύριος τῆς δόξης = πνεῦμα. See also TWBNT VII, 520.

3. Text: ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον.

9.17 Wisdom is identified, by means of parallelismus membrorum, with the Holy Spirit:

βοῦλὴν δέ σου τίς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν
καὶ ἔπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων;

Aristobulus¹ regards σοφία as a personified hypostasis, the source of all light,² and associates σοφία with the θεῖον πνεῦμα by which Moses is acclaimed a prophet.³ Philo, on the other hand, usually refers to the "Holy Spirit" only in terms of prophecy,⁴ and tends to equate σοφία with ὁ λόγος. But he does use the expression τὸ σοφίας πνεῦμα θεῖον (Giq. 47), in the context of a prayer

Eusebius (Praep. Ev. 7.12.4 and 11.14.4) quotes this passage as: ἔστιν γὰρ αὕτῃ πνεῦμα ; cf. J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom (Dropsie College edition; New York, 1957), p. 114.

1. On Aristobulus, see now N. Walter, Der Thorausleger Aristobulus (TU 86; Berlin, 1964).

2. Fr. No. 2, Stearns ed., Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers (Chicago, 1908), a passage that shows dependence upon Prov. 8.22 ff.

3. Fr. No. 3, 11.15-17.

4. But the role of σοφία in prophecy, according to other witnesses of Hellenistic Judaism, is important for our illumination of the theology of the Corinthian opponents, not only in 1 Cor. 2, but also in their understanding of prophecy in 1 Cor. 12-14. See e.g. Aristobulus, Fr. No. 3 cited in preceding note, and Wis. Sol. 7.27. On 1 Cor. 12-14 see Chapter Five.

that the divine Spirit of Wisdom

not readily depart and be gone, but abide with us a very long time, as she did with Moses the wise.

This background enables us to reconstruct the Corinthian doctrine of the Spirit which underlies the arguments of Paul in 1 Corinthians 2.10 ff. In this passage Paul stresses that it is the Spirit of God who alone knows τὰ βᾶθη τοῦ θεοῦ,¹ and who reveals to the

1. According to Wilckens, the phrase τὰ βᾶθη τοῦ θεοῦ is "typisch gnostisch." The gnostic texts to which he refers only show that the phrase was used by some Gnostics. That the phrase is inherently "gnostic" cannot be maintained. As a matter of fact, the expression is attested earlier in Jewish apocalyptic, which appears to be the source for both Gnostics and Paul. The apocalyptic provenance Wilckens himself admits in a footnote (Weisheit, p. 83): "Die Vorstellung von den 'Tiefen Gottes' findet sich recht vielfach belegt auch in jüdisch-apokalyptischen Texten: Vgl. die bereits angeführten Stellen 1 Hen. 63,2f. . . . sowie 1 QS XI, 18ff. Ausserdem z.B. noch IV Esr. 4, 10.21; 10,35ff; Syr. Bar. 14,8f . . . und 54,12f. . . . Die Tiefen Gottes sind hier überall die unerforschlichen eschatologischen Ratschlüsse Gottes. . . . In diesem Sinne ist der Begriff βᾶθος in dem einzigen anderen paulinischen Beleg Röm 11,33ff. zu verstehen" To this I have only to add that this is precisely the context in which Paul uses the term in 1 Cor. 2.10; note also the use of Is. 40.13 in 2.16 as in Rom. 11.34. One further note: Wilckens is probably wrong in placing the Valentinian aeon βυθός in the same context as the term βᾶθη τοῦ θεοῦ (Weisheit, p. 82, n. 1). Βυθός and Σιγή are terms which refer to the highest world of being in the Chaldean Oracles (cf. H. Lewy, Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy [Cairo, 1956], pp. 77 and 160). The history-of-religions background of these designations is the same for the Chaldaean

elect τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν. But for Paul the "Spirit of God" is not identical with σοφία, as it seems to have been with his opponents.¹ For the opponents Sophia, the Holy Spirit, was the source of their knowledge of heavenly wisdom. Wisdom of Solomon 7.21-22 expresses quite adequately what their view would have been:

ὅσα τέ ἐστιν κρυπτά καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἔγνων· ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία. ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον

To such a doctrine Paul is obliged to reply--by positing a complete differentiation between Sophia and the Holy Spirit--

ἀ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος (2.13).²

The word ἀνθρωπίνης is polemical. The Corinthians were not claiming a purely human philosophy, but they were describing their own experience of the Holy Spirit in the religious terms of their background in Hellenistic Judaism: The Spirit is the Wisdom of God, and the Spirit-Wisdom bestows the gift of wisdom upon those who choose to cultivate her gifts, and to live upon her supra-mundane

Oracles and Valentinianism; viz. Pythagorizing Platonism. (See Lewy, p. 397).

1. Also Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 81.

2. The text is problematical here; Blass may be correct in deleting λόγοις. See Blass-Debrunner-Funk, p. 98.

level. The use of the word ἀνθρώπινος is not without significance, however, nor does it entirely miss the mark, for it is a polemical dismissal of any notion that man has within himself a spiritual capacity for divine wisdom, a notion which is reflected in 1 Corinthians 2.13b.

Excursus: Σοφία as Holy Spirit in Early Patristic and Gnostic Literature

The identification of σοφία with the Holy Spirit, originating in Hellenistic Judaism, occurs also in patristic and gnostic texts. For example, in Demonstratio 5, Irenaeus states

. . . So the Word is fitly and properly called the Son, but the Spirit the Wisdom of God.¹

Similarly, in Adversus Haereses 4.20.1 (= Harvey ed., 4.34.1), Irenaeus says,

Adest enim ei (i.e. with God the Father) semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos et loquitur, dicens, 'Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram'²

1. Trans. J. Smith, St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching (Ancient Christian Writers 16; Westminster, Maryland, 1952).

2. Cf. also 4.20.2-4 and 4.7.4.

Theophilus of Antioch, too, equates the Holy Spirit with the Wisdom of God. At Ad Autolycum 1.7

Theophilus says,

ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας
ἐποίησε τὰ πάντα, τῷ γὰρ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἐστερεώθησαν
οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν
(cf. Ps. 32.6 LXX).

And at 2.15 Theophilus refers to the Trinity

(τριάς) in the following terms:

ὡσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι τῶν φωστήρων
γεγονυῖαι τύποι εἰσὶν τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ.¹

On the other hand, Justin Martyr equates σοφία with the Son (Dial. 61 and 100), as do Athenagoras (Suppl. 24), Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 4.25), Origen (De Princ. 1.2.3), et al.²

The identification of Sophia with the Holy Spirit is well attested in Gnostic literature. See, for example, Irenaeus' account of the "Barbelo-gnostics" (Adv. Haer. 1.29.4 = Harvey ed. 1.27.2):

1. Cf. also ps.-Clem. Hom. 16.12 for the same doctrine.

2. One can see the beginnings of this in the Synoptic gospels. See e.g. on Lk. 11.49 J. M. Robinson, "Λόγοι Σοφῶν. Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q," in Zeit und Geschichte, p. 78.

ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου ἀγγέλου προβληθῆναι λέγουσι
πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὃ σοφίαν καὶ προυνικὸν προσηγόρευσαν.

A similar doctrine is attested for the Valentinians (Adv. Haer. 1.4.1) and later for the Simonians (Epiphanius, Pan. 21.214).

Πνευματικός-Ψυχικός in 1 Corinthians 2.13b

The difficulty with 1 Corinthians 2.13b-16 is--as is indeed the case with the whole passage, 2.6 ff.--that it is Paul's own statement, yet it must be regarded as incorporating the terminology of the opponents, albeit in a manner which Paul can use in his own argumentation. This is a striking phenomenon,¹ all the more so when it is observed that this passage actually forms a transition in preparation for his own defense of his apostolic office and authority (4.1-5).²

It is, in any case, unlikely that Paul himself coined the expression, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες.

1. On this phenomenon in the Pauline letters, see Koester's remarks in The Bible and Modern Scholarship, pp. 192 ff.

2. Funk, Language, p. 296.

This phrase is thoroughly Greek in its intent,¹ and although Paul is himself influenced by the Stoic-Cynic diatribe style,² the idea expressed in 1 Corinthians 2.13 is nowhere else attested in his writings. For this reason, it is safe to assign it to his opponents. This becomes even more evident when it is recalled that the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology elsewhere in 1 Corinthians has already been established as belonging to Paul's opponents.³

It remains now to place the expression πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, and the πνευματικός-ψυχικός contrast in 2.13-14, in the proper contextual background. As we have seen in the case of 1 Corinthians 15, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology stems from a Hellenistic-

1. See Conzelmann, NTS 12, p. 240; he refers to the motif "Gleich durch Gleiches" as "ein wesentliches spezifisch griechisches Motiv." Cf. also Almqvist, Plutarch und das N. T., p. 93: "Die rhetorische Zusammenstellung verschiedener Formen desselben Wortes (Paronomasie) ist in der Diatribe sehr beliebt." As to the content of the phrase, see A. D. Nock, Sallustius, p. lxvii: "That nothing mortal can know what is immortal is a thought commonly expressed. Such knowledge is in virtue of divine Nous, used by every good soul." And see below.

2. R. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (FRLANT 13; Göttingen, 1910).

3. See on 1 Cor. 15, Chapter Three.

Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7. It is the same exegetical tradition which stands back of the terminology in 1 Corinthians 2. For, in addition to the affirmation of man's immortality--i.e. the immortality of his νοῦς or πνεῦμα, which God breathed into him in creation--the very possibility of knowing God and his wisdom are affirmed on the basis of the same passage in Genesis, by which a very basic doctrine of Hellenistic philosophy is given expression.

For example, Philo, using Scripture-exegesis to express a Greek philosophical commonplace regarding man's νοῦς,¹ discourses as follows (Det. 86):

Let us, therefore, the pupils of Moses, no longer be in doubt as to how man has attained a conception of the invisible God. For Moses himself learned the means by a divine oracle (χρησμῶ) and has communicated it to us, putting it thus. The Creator prepared for the body no soul (ψυχὴν οὐδεμίαν) sufficient of itself to perceive its Maker, but considering that it would be of great benefit for his creature if he could attain a conception of the One who made him--since this is the determining factor in achieving happiness and

1. See p.23 , n.3 , for the reference to A. D. Nock. This idea, according to Dörrie, goes back to Parmenides, and his equation of Being and thinking. So, from Plato and Aristotle on, the investigation of Being is τῷ τῆς διανοίας λογισμῶ or by means of νοῦς. See H. Dörrie, "Emanation. Ein unphilosophisches Wort im spätantiken Denken," in Parusia. Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus (Festschrift J. Hirschberger; Frankfurt, 1965), p. 132, n. 43.

blessedness--breathed into him from above of his own divinity (ἄνωθεν ἐνέπνει τῆς ἰδίου θεϊότητος).

In what follows Philo explains that this is why so small a thing as the νοῦς of man has room for the whole of the universe in its conceptions, for it is an ἀπόσπασμα of the Deity (Det. 90). The crucial scripture text, for Philo, is Genesis 2.7, the χρησμός to which he refers in the passage quoted above.¹

Again, Philo (in Leg. All. 1.36) interprets the word ἐνεφύσησεν in Genesis 2.7 as involving three things, τὸ ἐμπνέον, τὸ δεχόμενον, and τὸ ἐμπνεόμενον.

That which inbreathes is God, that which receives is the mind (ὁ νοῦς), that which is inbreathed is the spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα). What, therefore, follows from these premises? There comes to be a union (ἐνῶσις) of the three, as God extends the power from himself through the mediating spirit until it reaches the subject. And for what purpose, except that we might receive a conception of him? For how could the soul have thought of God, if he had not inbreathed it and grasped it with power?

Thus, for Philo, man has within him--breathed into him by God--the capacity for knowing God and the higher truths of the universe. This ability does not belong to man's ψυχή by nature; it was given to him by God, who

1. For the preceding context of Det. 86 see above, p. 52.

breathed into man from his own divine spirit. Man has a higher soul, a νοῦς or πνεῦμα, which enables him to rise above the level of his earthly and sense-perceptive soul¹ and to receive impressions from the heavenly sphere.

These texts illuminate for us the background of 1 Corinthians 2.13b-14. The basis of man's ability to receive the Wisdom of God, the Holy Spirit, is his own πνευματικός nature given him in creation (Gen. 2.7). The principle of "like known by like" which we have encountered in the Philonic texts above explain the phrase in 13b: πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες and the Philonic distinction between man's higher soul, his νοῦς or πνεῦμα, and his earthly soul, account for the distinction between the πνευματικός and ψυχικός natures reflected in 1 Corinthians 2.13-14.

The opponents of Paul in Corinth were teaching that they had the potentiality of becoming πνευματικοί within themselves by virtue of the πνευματικός nature given them by God, and that by a cultivation of Wisdom they could rise above the earthly and ψυχικός level of existence and anticipate heavenly glory. Those who had attained these experiences were πνευματικοί and τέλειοι,²

1. αἰσθητικὴ ψυχὴ, cf. e.g. Spec. Leg. 4.123.

2. And εὐγενεῖς; see excursus below.

in contradistinction to the *νήπιοι* who were still living on the *ψυχικός* level of existence.

Excursus: *Εὐγένεια* in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f.

It is probable that the term *εὐγενεῖς* in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f. does not simply refer to aristocratic birth, but to a claim of the Corinthian opponents to *εὐγένεια*, a technical term whose background is to be found in Hellenistic Judaism. In Philo's *De Virtutibus*, in the section entitled *περὶ εὐγενείας*, this terminology is laid bare. Philo begins this section by remarking that natural or bodily *εὐγένεια* is of no consequence, but what is important is the *εὐγένεια* which comes to one whose soul has received wisdom. There follows this passage:

When God on account of his kindness and love for man desired to establish this (*scil.* *τὴν εὐγένειαν* *ὡς μέγιστον ἀγαθόν*) among us also, he found no worthier temple (*νεών*) on earth than the mind (*λογισμοῦ*). For as the better part it alone bears an image of the Good (*ἀγαματοφορεῖ τ' ἀγαθόν*), even though some of those who have never tasted--or have only sipped--of wisdom may disbelieve (*Virt.* 188).

This passage provides one more example of the capacity of the higher soul of man (here called *λογισμός* a synonym for *νοῦς*) to receive wisdom. But it also tells

us that the one whose soul has received wisdom is the one who is truly *εὐγενής*. It is this notion of *εὐγένεια* that Paul may be polemicizing against in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f. This would explain why the Jeremianic triad of *ὁ σοφός, ὁ ἰσχυρός, ὁ πλούσιος*, becomes in Paul's application of Jeremiah 9.22 f. the *σοφοί*, the *δύνατοι*, and the *εὐγενεῖς*.¹

In the same section of *De Virtutibus* Philo speaks of Abraham and the inspiration he received from the Spirit which enhanced his appearance and provided his words with persuasive power (*τοῖς δὲ λόγοις πειθῶ*, *Virt.* 217). This may provide some background for Paul's disclaimer of eloquence in 1 Corinthians 2.4,² if indeed the Corinthian opponents were claiming for themselves *πειθὸν λόγων* as one of the signs of their pneumatic status as *σοφοί* and *εὐγενεῖς*.³

1. Cf. also 1 Sam. 2.10 LXX. The use of *δύνατοι* for *ἰσχυρός* may be explained as due to the currency of the term *δύναμις* in the opponents' theology. It is frequent in the context from 1.18-2.5.

2. I would prefer the reading, *οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας λόγων* even though its attestation is minimal (440 it sy^p sa Or). Note the consequent balance between *πειθοῖ* and *ἀποδείξει*.

3. The ecstatic, or "prophetic," aspect of their speaking ability is documented in 1 Cor. 12-14. See Chapter Five.

The Πνευματικός and the Ψυχικός, Paul's Re-interpretation

In 1 Corinthians 2.13b ff. Paul is accommodating himself to the opponents' terminology, but is radically re-interpreting it. For Paul the πνευματικός man is the one who walks according to the Spirit of God in the light of what he has received from God (v. 12, cf. Rom. 8) apart from any created potentiality in himself.¹ The gift of the Spirit is a gift of free grace, and is an eschatological event. The "psychic" man, for Paul, is the one who has only natural possibilities apart from the eschatological gift of the Spirit, and cannot attain to τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ by virtue of anything within himself. To such a man, who has not received the Spirit, the things of the Spirit are μωρία (2.14).² Paul thus affirms the radical break between God and natural man, a break which can be bridged only from God's side, by his love and by

1. Strictly speaking, Paul is referring in 2.15 primarily to himself. He is the one who has the "mind (= Spirit) of Christ" and is therefore not subject to the criticism of the Corinthians (4.3 and 9.3). See Funk, Language, pp. 297 ff.; and Dahl, NTT 54, p. 13.

2. Clearly Paul's own expression; cf. 1.18, 21, 23, 25, 27; 3.18-19; 4.10.

his decisive act in Christ.¹

For Paul the term πνεῦμα is understood in apocalyptic fashion (as has already been observed with the term σοφία). The Spirit is the divine eschatological gift which has been poured out among the elect of the last times. In no case can it be said--in Paul's view of the matter--that man has a divine or "spiritual" element within him. This Paul explicitly denies in 2.11, where he distinguishes between the πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων (with its ability to know τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and the πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ who alone has natural knowledge of τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Never the twain shall meet, on a natural basis. The supernatural and eschatological gift of the Spirit God gives to whom he will, frequently to the "fools" and "base-born" of this world (1.27-29). He who has received this gift can be prophetically referred to as πνευματικός,² though man's full attainment of the πνευματικός existence is yet to be

1. Cf. in this connection Luck's observations on the differences in the manner in which the wisdom tradition is appropriated in James and in the letters of Paul, TLZ 92, p. 256.

2. Cf. Paul's references to the eschatological gift of the Spirit as an ἄρραβών, 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; retained in the deuterio-Pauline Eph. 1.14.

realized in the future, in the resurrection from the dead (1 Cor. 15.46 ff.).

For Paul, too, the gift of the Spirit of God has consequences not only for the "spirit" of man, or for the related experiences one can have, but for his entire existence, and especially his conduct in the body. So Paul stresses that the Christian's σῶμα, not only his νοῦς, is the "temple" of the Spirit of God (6.20).¹ Further, Paul states in a passage heavy with irony that his opponents in Corinth cannot be called τέλειοι or πνευματικοί, because of their conduct in the community, their ζήλος καὶ ἔρις, which is a sign that they are still νήπιοι, still σαρκικοί (3.1,3).²

1. Cf. Philo's reference (Virt. 188) to man's λογισμός or νοῦς as the νεώς of God and his Wisdom, quoted above, p. 111 .

2. Cf. Gal. 5.20, where ἔρις and ζήλος occur side by side in a list of ἔργα τῆς σαρκός. It is clear that for Paul σαρκικός and ψυχικός mean the same thing, and that σαρκικός is Paul's own term; cf. Funk, Language, p. 296. For Paul's view of the spheres of "Spirit" and "Flesh" see Bultmann, Theology, I, 232 ff., 207, 333 ff. For the background in Jewish eschatology, see A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery (London, 1931), pp. 160 ff.; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," in The Scrolls and the New Testament, pp. 157 ff.; Jacob Licht, "An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD," Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV, 88 ff.; David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and pre-Pauline

In summary, it has been determined that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 2.1-6, has skillfully used the language of his opponents, and has turned it back against them by interpreting their language in an apocalyptic fashion. In doing so, Paul has not succumbed to the theology of his opponents, but has substituted his own concept of "wisdom" for that of his opponents.¹ Using their terminology, he has robbed them of their claim to a sapientia propria, and has stressed in contrast that the true wisdom, which is "foolishness" for men governed by the values of this world, is a sapientia aliena, given by God to man by the Spirit, and whose content is simply . . . the word of the cross. Thus, there is no ground for boasting at all. The Christian is, in Dahl's phrase, "simul sapiens et stultus."²

Christianity," Scripta Hier., IV, 215 ff.; and J. Pryke, "Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," Rev Qum 19,5 (1965), 345 ff.

1. Admirably argued by Funk, Language, pp. 303-305 et passim.

2. N. Dahl, NTT 54, p. 6.

Γνώσις in 1 Corinthians 8

One further item must be noted, in view of the attempts by some scholars to posit a "gnostic" provenance for Paul's Corinthian opponents: The context in which the technical terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός occur is one in which γνώσις is conspicuous for its absence. This can be no accident, for Paul would scarcely have omitted a reference to γνώσις in this context if it had been technically used as part of the opponents' claim to be πνευματικοί. The opponents claimed σοφία, and not a γνώσις, technically understood, and it was their possession of σοφία which led them to claim for themselves a "pneumatic" status.

Of course, there is evidence that both the Corinthians and Paul used the term γνώσις, and both valued it as part of their Christian experience. The question is, what did γνώσις mean for the opponents and for Paul?

One thing is quite clear: It did not mean the same as σοφία.¹ This is evident from the distinction

1. Cf. Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 3, where Schmithals is criticized for erroneously equating σοφία with γνώσις, and letting it go at that; cf. Schmithals, Gnosis, pp. 130 ff., for a reply.

which Paul makes between γνῶσις and σοφία in 1 Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians 1.5 Paul praises the Corinthians that they have been enriched by God ἐν παντί λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνῶσει. Is this a compliment which he later retracts when he denies his opponents a share in the σοφία which is reserved for the τέλειοι?¹ The only explanation is that for Paul and for the opponents as well, γνῶσις is not the same as σοφία.

This is clear also from 1 Corinthians 12.8, where λόγος σοφίας is differentiated from λόγος γνώσεως. Similarly in 13.2 τὰ μυστήρια πάντα are mentioned alongside of πᾶσα ἡ γνῶσις. τὰ μυστήρια πάντα here are all of the individual "mysteries"² which together comprise the plan of God in his dealings with his people now and in the future, the knowledge of which is called σοφία.³

What, then, is γνῶσις? The answer to this can be found in 1 Corinthians 8.1 ff. Both for the opponents and for Paul, γνῶσις is Christian insight into the realities

1. This point is made by A. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," p. 89. Much of my argument I owe to this perspicacious contribution.

2. Cf. 1 Cor. 2.7; 15.51; Rom. 11.25.

3. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," p. 92. Cf. above, pp. 92 ff.

of Christian existence here and now and its practical consequences.¹ Its basis is the knowledge of the One God, and the Christian confession of Christ as Lord (8.6), with the concomitant affirmation that idols are not gods at all.²

The Corinthians had formulated their γνῶσις as follows:

οἶδαμεν ὅτι, οὐδέν εἰδωλὸν ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ
ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς.

This is a "knowledge" which they assumed that all Christians possess: πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν (8.2).³ The trouble was that some of the Corinthians concluded from this that everyone in the community had sufficient γνῶσις so as to enable them to eat meat that had been sacrificed to idols, a piece of gnosis which they had undoubtedly

1. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," p. 93.

2. This idea of γνῶσις is widespread in Judaism: Cf. Wis. Sol. 12.23-14.31; Judith 8.20; Ep. Jer. 22, 28, 50, 64, 71; and cf. Gal. 4.8; see Bultmann, TDNT, I, 702. But I cannot agree with his view that γνῶσις in 1 Cor. 8.1 is a gnostic technical term, ibid., p. 709, followed by Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 212, and Schmithals, Gnosis, pp. 134 ff. The whole context is against this view.

3. See now also U. Mauser, "Galater iii.20: die Universalität des Heils," NTS 13 (1966/7), 266. The basis of this "knowledge" is the baptismal confession, "One God, One Lord." Cf. on this confession E. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ (FRLANT 24; Göttingen, 1926), p. 255. Cf. also Hegermann, Schöpfungsmittler, p. 111.

received from Paul himself,¹ for they were all agreed on the non-reality of idol gods. Here Paul is constrained to remind them that not all Christians do in fact have sufficient γνῶσις for that:

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις· τίνες δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὕσα μολύνεται (8.7).

Paul's concern for the "weak" in conscience constrains him to remind those with a greater proportion of γνῶσις that ἀγάπη, after all, is a greater standard of conduct in the Christian community than γνῶσις. And if anyone does not know this, he is really ignorant of a necessary item in the Christian faith:

εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὕπω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι· εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (8.2-3).

And when γνῶσις is claimed to the detriment of ἀγάπη, the claimants to γνῶσις become "puffed up" (8.1), and the brother's salvation is placed in jeopardy (8.11). For, after all, γνῶσις is not complete for anyone in this life (13.9); it will pass away (13.8), and be replaced by a perfect vision πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον. ἀγάπη alone, of

1. Whether Paul was ignorant of the "Apostolic Decree" (Acts 15.29; cf. 21.25) or deliberately ignored it (Gal. 2.6), the effect in his congregations was the same.

all the spiritual gifts, is permanent, and this is the highest standard of Christian conduct,¹ so that even πίστις and ἐλπίς are less enduring than, and inferior to, ἀγάπη.

In any case, the term γνῶσις in 1 Corinthians 8.1 cannot be regarded as a "gnostic" technical term.² The consequences of this are, in my opinion, quite clear: Paul's opponents in Corinth were not "Gnostics" in the technical sense. Indeed, the affirmation--as part of the Corinthian γνῶσις--that there is "one God," of whom all things exist, excludes this possibility.

1. I take μένει in 13.13 to be conditioned by νυνὶ δέ; cf. the transitory sense of μένειν in 1 Corinthians 15.6.

2. Cf. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," for the use of the term γνῶσις in other Pauline contexts.

Chapter V

ON SPIRITUAL GIFTS IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12-14

"Prophecy" in Corinth

There is one further context in 1 Corinthians (in addition to 1 Cor. 2 and 15) in which the claim on the part of Paul's opponents to "pneumatic" status occurs; viz., the passage dealing with spiritual gifts, 1 Corinthians 12-14. There is no question here of an interpretation of Genesis 2.7, nor does the contrasting term ψυχικός occur in this context. Indeed, the term πνεῦμα itself bears a rather different connotation than that established for those contexts in which Genesis 2.7 exegesis is a deciding factor. In 1 Corinthians 12-14 πνεῦμα is an external force, in the view of the opponents, which possesses a subject and enables him to engage in ecstatic speech. The opponents of Paul in Corinth evidently placed a high premium on the gift of ecstatic "prophecy," so much

so that Paul finds it necessary to counter their enthusiasm with the observation that ecstatic speech is not the only, nor even the most important, "spiritual gift."

The claim on the part of the Corinthian opponents to the designation πνευματικοί on the basis of their facility in ecstatic speech is documented at 1 Corinthians 14.37. Paul says, εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός, κτλ. One can conclude from this that there were people in the Corinthian congregation who regarded themselves as "prophets" and "spiritual," and that they defined their status as "spiritual" in terms of "prophecy." From the context in 1 Corinthians 14, it can be inferred that for them "prophecy" consisted in ecstatic utterances and "speaking in tongues." This ability was characterized by them as a major "spiritual gift," a πνευματικόν, and this endowment was the ground for an enthusiastic boasting.

Furthermore, Paul's use of the word τέλειος in 14.20--and the contrasting words παιδία, νηπιάζετε --is an indication that the Corinthians conceived of their role as "perfect" in terms of "prophetic" endowments as well as "wisdom."¹

1. See Chapter Four.

The Corinthians' definition of "prophecy" in terms of ecstatic speaking is not, of course, limited to Corinth. It is taken for granted in, e.g., Acts 19.6 (cf. 10. 45-46).¹ Paul, however, makes a sharp distinction between prophecy and ecstatic utterance (14.1-5), and regards "prophecy" (as he understands it) as greater than the gift of tongues. Furthermore, he undercuts any ground of enthusiastic boasting by insisting that the πνεύματα are not the special property of a spiritual elite, but that there is only one Spirit who is operative--albeit in different manifestations--in all Christians.²

It is important to stress that Paul does not reject ecstatic speech outright; Paul is thankful that he himself speaks in tongues more than any of the Corinthians (14.8)! For Paul glossolalia is a legitimate charisma (12.10,28) which must not be summarily prohibited (14.39), since it can be a manifestation of the end-time (14.21), and is a vehicle of private prayer (14.14; cf. Rom. 8.15, 26 f.). Paul's overarching concern, however, is that the

1. It probably lies in the background of the "Pentecost" account in Acts 2; note especially vv. 4,15.

2. See below, on 1 Cor. 12.1 ff.

community be edified, that all things be done in the community for its οἰκοδομή.

The history-of-religions background of ecstatic prophecy has been thoroughly discussed by others.¹ As to the phenomenon in Paul's Corinthian congregation Schmithals is correct in stating,

Dass es Gnostiker im technischen Sinne dieser Wortes sind, gegen die Pls angeht, lässt sich freilich aus Kp. 14 nicht bindend beweisen.²

Nevertheless Schmithals does go on to interpret the phenomenon of glossalalia in 1 Corinthians 14 as a gnostic manifestation, thus remaining consistent with his over-all approach to the problem of the opponents of Paul in 1 and 2 Corinthians. This, in my view, is quite

1. See the articles by Oepke, TWBNT II, 449 ff., and Behm, TWBNT I, 719 ff.; see also Leisegang, Der Heilige Geist, pp. 113 ff.; and especially Erich Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ (Giessen, 1927), a linguistic and historical study which is still a standard work. Fascher, however, has little to say about 1 Cor. 14. In his view, the Corinthians interpreted προφητεία simply as "die von Gott oder dem heiligen Geist inspirierte Rede." He finds in the N. T. generally no occurrence of the view that the νοῦς should be banished so that the prophet as κατεχόμενος or ἔνθεος can speak, nor is there to be found in the N. T., in his view, a complex psychology such as is found in Plato, Plutarch, and Philo. See ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, pp. 168 f. And see below, p. 128.

2. Gnosis, p. 164.

arbitrary, especially when a more probable background for the practice of ecstatic speech in Corinth can be found; viz., in the pagan Hellenistic world in general, and in a Hellenistic Judaism strongly influenced by this broader sphere in particular.

The most fruitful place to look for a background to the enthusiastic practices of the Corinthian opponents of Paul is, once again, Philo. Philo regards prophetic ecstasy as the highest manifestation of the divine Spirit, given only to a relatively few good and wise persons. In an interesting allegory on Genesis 15.12 (in Her. 249 ff.) Philo engages in a lengthy discourse upon the various types of ecstasy. He distinguishes four different types:¹

- (1) madness (λύττα μανιώδης παράνοϊαν ἐμποιοῦσα),
- (2) extreme amazement (σφοδρὰ κατὰπληξίς), (3) passivity of mind (ἡρεμία διανοίας), and (4) divine possession (ἐνθεος κατοκωχή), the kind of μανία to which the prophets are subject (ἥ τὸ προφητικὸν γένος χρήται). The latter

1. Corresponding exactly to the four different types of μανία in Plato, Phaedrus 240A-250C, cf. 265B ff. See on this M. Pulver, "The Experience of the Pneuma in Philo," Spirit and Nature (Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks I; New York, 1954), p. 119.

type of ecstasy Philo calls ἡ δὲ πασῶν ἀρίστη, which comes to those who are chosen to be prophets.¹

Philo describes this prophetic ecstasy, by way of commenting on Genesis 15.12, περὶ ἡλίου δυσμὰς ἔκστασις ἐπέπεσεν, as follows:

He refers to our mind (νοῦς) under the symbol 'sun.' For what the mind (λογισμός) is in us, the sun is in the world, for each is a light-bearer, the one sending forth to the whole world a sense-perceptible beam, the other sending forth to us by means of its apprehensions mental rays. So long as the mind surrounds us with its illumination, pouring forth as it were a noon-time beam into the whole soul, we remain in ourselves and are not possessed. But when it comes to its setting, there falls upon us in all likelihood an ecstasy, a divine possession, a madness (ἔκστασις καὶ ἡ ἐνθεος . . . κατοκωχή τε καὶ μανία). For when the divine light shines, the human light sets; and when the former sets, the latter rises and dawns. This is what regularly happens to the race of prophets (τῷ δὲ προφητικῷ γένει), for the mind is evicted from us at the arrival of the divine Spirit (ἐξοικίζεται μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἄφικιν), but at its departure the mind enters once again. Mortal may not cohabit with immortal. Therefore the setting of the mind and the darkness around it produce ecstasy and divinely-inspired

1. Only to the δίκαιοι and σοφοί, Her. 259 f. Cf. also Wis. Sol. 7.27, where we are informed that it is Wisdom which makes men ("holy souls") "friends of God and prophets." In Philo (and in Wis. Sol.) we can observe a difference between what is called a "prophet" and the nabhi' of the O. T. The O. T. prophets play scarcely any role in Philo, since most of his Scripture quotations are from the Torah. Cf. Luhrmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, pp. 34 f.

madness (ἐκστασιν καὶ θεοφόρητον μανίαν). He (Moses) connects the following passage to this scripture by saying, 'it was said to Abraham' (ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβραάμ). For in reality the prophet, even when he seems to be speaking, is actually silent, while Another makes use of his organs of speech, the mouth and the tongue, expressing what he wishes. With an invisible musical skill, he plays on these organs and produces pleasant and elaborate sounds full of every harmony.¹

This passage (and others cited above) provides us with a background for an understanding of the prophetic self-understanding of the Corinthian enthusiasts. Even some of Philo's specific statements supply us with a key for interpreting Paul's arguments in 1 Corinthians 14. For example, Philo's statement that the νοῦς in us departs at the coming of the Spirit illumines Paul's counter-statement in 14.15: . . . προσεύχομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῷ. Philo's reference to the organs of speech as instruments of God² sheds light on Paul's reference to musical instruments in 14.7 ff. And Paul's use of the verb παίνεσθαι

1. Her. 263-266. A similar comment on Gen. 15.12 occurs in Quaest. Gen. 3.9. On prophetic ecstasy, see also Her. 69 f.; Vita Cont. 12; etc. For Philo's own experience, see Migr. Abr. 34 ff.

2. A very common Hellenistic metaphor; cf. e.g. Plutarch, De Orac. 9. On Porphyry and the Chaldaean Oracles, see H. Lewy, Chaldaean Oracles, pp. 41 ff.; and in general, see literature cited above.

in 14.23 is probably an ironic reference to the prophetic *μανία* of which Philo (and numerous other Hellenistic writers on prophecy) speaks.

In short, a background in Hellenistic Judaism--itself only part of a wider context of Hellenistic ecstatic practices--is most plausible as an explanation for the phenomenon of glossalalia in 1 Corinthians. The Corinthians claimed to be *πνευματικοί* on the basis of their ability to manifest certain *πνευματικά*, chief among which was the ecstatic speech which they deemed to be "prophecy" par excellence (1 Cor. 14.37). Perhaps they thought of themselves as speaking under the inspiration of the Spirit a type of *ἀγγελικὴ διαλέκτος*. This is at least suggested by 1 Corinthians 13.1.¹

Nor is this claim completely unconnected with the theme of *σοφία* delineated above. For the Corinthian enthusiasts, *σοφία* and *γλῶσσαι* belonged together; both were signs of a truly spiritual existence. This interconnection between wisdom and ecstatic "prophecy" is attested in Hellenistic Judaism,² in which the Corinthians

1. Cf. Job's daughter in the Testament of Job 48:
 . . . ἀπεφθέγγετο δὲ τῇ ἀγγελικῇ διαλέκτῳ, . . .

2. Cf. above, p. 101.

were apparently well-schooled.

Paul is as critical of the Corinthians' claim to "prophecy" as he is of their claim to "wisdom." Indeed he redefines the term for them, opposing "prophecy" to speaking in tongues. For Paul, prophecy involves speaking clearly and understandably (and in a manner consonant with the confession of faith, Rom. 12.6) for the exhortation and edification of all in the community (1 Cor. 14.2 ff.). In 1 Corinthians 12-14 Paul is facing a dangerous understanding of the church and its worship. As Luhrmann puts it,

Für die Gegner war der Gottesdienst eine Versammlung von Ekstatikern, die die Sprache der oberen Welt beherrschten und in der Ekstase diese Welt verliessen. Solch ein Gottesdienst verlöre aber den missionarischen Charakter (14,23); Paulus rechnet mit nicht zur Gemeinde gehörenden ἰδιώται und ἄπιστοι; die Gemeinde ist damit eine Grösse in der Geschichte. Ziel des Gottesdienstes sind οἰκοδομή, παρακλήσις und παραμυθία (14.3), die nur durch Charismen ἐν νοῦ erreicht werden können.¹

Further, it appears that the Corinthians were bent on emphasizing a hyper-individualistic approach to worship, bound up as they were with their own individual experiences of tongue-speaking. Paul responds by calling them back to

1. Offenbarungsverständnis, p. 38.

their missionary task, to a concern for the church's corporate οἰκοδομή and to her common pursuit of ἀγάπη (14.12,1).

Πνευματικά and the 'Ἀνάθεμα' Ἰησοῦς in 1 Corinthians 12.1 ff.

It is in this same context that 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 also belongs. Inasmuch as it has been suggested that τῶν πνευματικῶν in 12.1 is masculine in gender, it is desirable to deal with this passage to see if it does shed further light on the πνευματικός self-understanding of Paul's Corinthian opponents.

I refer here particularly to Schmithals' arguments on this passage. In affirming the masculine gender for τῶν πνευματικῶν Schmithals states that Paul never used the term πνευματικά in the sense of χαρίσματα.¹ He regards this passage as a reply to a question from the Corinthian congregation as to whether it were possible to make in church such an utterance as ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς and still be

1. Gnosis, pp. 161-165. 1 Cor. 14.1ab he regards as an interpolation (p. 163). On the question of gender, see below.

speaking ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ.¹ According to Schmithals such an acclamation was a regular feature of Corinthian worship, and indeed served as a type of confession of faith.²

To the question, "Wie konnte ein guter Christ Jesus verfluchen?" Schmithals answers that this is possible in the context of a specific understanding of Christianity for which an anathema against Jesus is not excluded; namely, the gnostic Christianity prevailing in Corinth.³ Schmithals posits the existence in Corinth of gnostic Christians who could, paradoxically, confess Χριστός but still cry out, ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς. This phenomenon Schmithals interprets in the context of an alleged dualism between πνεῦμα and σὰρξ, and a Christological distinction between the heavenly Spirit-Christ and the man Jesus. He cites 1 John 2.22 and 4.2 as N. T. parallels.⁴ Especially ingenious is his

1. Gnosis, p. 117. He includes this passage in his "Letter B." For his literary-critical analysis of the Corinthian letters, see pp. 81-94; for a good critique, see Georgi's review, in VF (1958/59), p. 96.

2. Gnosis, p. 119.

3. For Schmithals' reconstruction of the Corinthian "gnostic system," see especially Gnosis, pp. 44-49, 58-65, and 117 ff.

4. That some form of docetism is being combatted in 1 John is quite probable, but that 1 Cor. 12.1-3 refers to a heretical Christology is, as I shall show, improbable.

reference to Origen's Contra Celsum 6.28¹ as another parallel, in which reference is made to Gnostics who do not allow anyone into their congregation ἐὰν μὴ ἀπὸς θῆται κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.¹

It seems to me, however, that Schmithals' question "Wie konnte ein guter Christ Jesus verfluchen?" must receive a negative answer. It is impossible for any kind of Christian to curse Jesus, no matter how erroneous his views or how loose his behavior.² Indeed, the very impossibility of such a thing is precisely the basis upon which our Pauline passage must be understood.

1. It is doubtful that even the Ophites, against whom Origen polemicizes in Contra Celsum 6.28, actually cursed Jesus. On Contra Celsum 6.28, and the question of its applicability to 1 Cor. 12.1-3, see now my article, "Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?" in JBL 86 (1967), 301-305.

2. Schmithals' arguments on this passage have been accepted by Wilckens, Weisheit, p. 121, n. 1; and Georgi regards his exegesis of 12.1-3 as the best and most persuasive argument in his whole book; see Georgi's review in VF. Others have rejected Schmithals' interpretation, including Luhrmann, Offenbarungsverständnis, pp. 28 ff. Hans Conzelmann has stated orally, in a N. T. seminar at Harvard (April 13, 1964), that he does not accept Schmithals' view; for Conzelmann's own interpretation of 12.1-3, to which I have not been privy, see his forthcoming commentary on 1 Cor. in the HNT series.

First of all, there is not to be found in 1-Corinthians 12.1-3 any distinction at all between Χριστός and Ἰησοῦς. It is not a matter of variant confessions or variant Christologies. The only confession of faith referred to is the one that was undoubtedly used in all of the Pauline churches, including the church in Corinth; viz., κύριος Ἰησοῦς, "Jesus is Lord."¹ The one distinction that is made in our passage is not one of variant confessions, but it is the distinction between the Corinthians' heathen past (ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε) and their Christian present.² Paul understands their heathen past to have been determined by their devotion to εἰδωλα ἁφωνα, or rather to demonic

1. Cf. Rom. 10.9; Phil. 2.11; 1 Cor. 8.6; Rom. 1.4; etc.; see also U. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (New Testament Tools and Studies 5; Grand Rapids, 1963), pp. 43 ff. On 1 Cor. 2.8, κύριος τῆς δόξης, see above, pp. 88 ff.

2. J. Massingberd Ford, in "The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews," CBQ 38 (1966), 410, comments that 1 Cor. 12.2 "may not imply that the Corinthians were heathen when Paul converted them: Paul may be thinking of the ancestors of Abraham" Her argument here seems to me far-fetched; the vast amount of important Jewish material she has discovered in 1 Cor. can just as easily be explained if one posits that the leadership in the Corinthian church had grown up in Hellenistic Judaism, but that most of the members were in fact Gentiles.

powers. In their past, before their baptism,¹ they had been led by (ἡγεσθε), indeed were under restraint to (ὥς ἂν ἀπαγόμενοι), the demonic powers which are the real forces behind pagan idols.

That demonic forces are referred to here is evident from the use of the key expressions ἡγεσθε and ἀπαγόμενοι to which in an opposite sense can be compared the phrase in Romans 8.14, πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται. This is clear even if the text is corrupt at this point.² Paul is shown to be sharing the typical Jewish attitude toward idols and heathen gods current in late antiquity; namely, the view that behind the heathen gods and idols stand demonic powers. This is already clear from the way that the LXX translates certain Hebrew terms. For example, Ps. 95.5 (LXX 96.5) translates the Hebrew $\text{בְּזָוָה וּבְחַלְוָה}$ (vain, empty, idols) with

1. This passage should be added to the long list supplied by N. Dahl in his description of the preaching form which he calls "das soteriologische Kontrast-Schema." This preaching form is marked by the contrast between the "once" and the "now," oriented soteriologically, with baptism as the turning point. See Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, pp. 5 ff. On the revelation-schema discussed by Dahl in the same article, see above, pp. 84 ff.

2. Better sense can be made of the text if one conjectures either πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα ἡγεσθε ὥς ἂν ἀπαγόμενοι or ὥς ἂν ἀπαγόμενοι ἡγεσθε.

the Greek word δαιμόνια. Similarly at Ps. 105.37 (LXX 106.37) the Hebrew לַאֲדֹנָיִם (to lords, to idols) is rendered δαιμονίοις. At Isaiah 65.11 the Hebrew לַאֲדֹנָיִם (to 'Fortune' = Babylonian Jupiter) is rendered simply τῷ δαίμονι. In Baruch 4.7, there is a reference to sacrifice δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ which should doubtless be understood as a reference to idolatry. That this is also Paul's understanding of idolatry is shown not only from the present passage in 1 Corinthians 12 but also from 1 Corinthians 10.20 f. In 8.4 Paul had referred to the "knowledge" of the Corinthians¹ that an εἶδωλον is οὐδέν, and that οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. But in 1 Corinthians 10.20-21 he informs them that, whereas an idol is nothing in itself (εἶδωλον τί ἐστίν;), nevertheless the powers behind the idols are demonic powers, and to participate in a pagan cultic meal is to become a κοινωνὸς τῶν δαιμονίων.²

Thus, 1 Corinthians 12.2 refers to demonic powers, and to the control these powers had exercised over the lives of the Corinthians before they had become Christians.

1. See above, p. 119.

2. τραπέζης δαιμονίων in 10.21 seems to be an allusion to Is. 65.11, cited above.

The importance of this remark by Paul is clear when we perceive the total context; namely, the whole discussion of "spiritual gifts" in 1 Corinthians 12-14, and the implication that the demonic powers are capable of producing ecstatic prophecy of a sort which resembles that so highly vaunted by the Corinthian pneumatics. Ecstatic prophecy, glossolalia, as a phenomenon is not restricted to the Christian community, and ought not, therefore, be made a criterion for special status in the community. For Paul is saying that this demonic variety of ecstatic speech as such is not capable of leading men to confess Jesus as Lord; on the contrary, such ecstatic speaking could also lead to cursing Jesus. For Paul the demons not only "believe and tremble"¹ but are actively engaged in venting their curses against Jesus--possibly through ecstatic phenomena!--and against those who belong to him.² This they are capable of doing even by simulating the "spiritual gift" of ecstatic prophecy. Paul's point

1. James 2.19, a commonplace, as witness Justin Dial. 49.

2. For Paul the demonic ἄρχοντες knew who the "Lord of glory" was; what they did not know was that by crucifying him they would bring their own domain to defeat and open up the way of salvation to men. Cf. above on 1 Cor. 2.8.

is simply that possession of the Spirit is not to be judged by the occurrence of ecstatic speaking "in tongues" but by the utterance of the common Christian (baptismal) confession.

The key to a proper understanding of 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 is the recognition that it belongs to the whole context in chapters 12-14. If it is interpreted in isolation, as is done by Schmithals, the point of Paul's argument is lost. That it does belong to the wider context is clear from *περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν* in 12.1, a heading that governs the entire argument in 12-14. *τῶν πνευματικῶν* is to be taken as a neuter; the *πνευματικά* in 12.1 are the same as the *χαρίσματα* in 12.4¹ and the whole context concerns "spiritual gifts."

Paul's argument is a shocking one, and was undoubtedly intended to be such. Paul is arguing that the gift of ecstatic speech is not to be unduly exalted above other spiritual gifts, since ecstatic speech--qua ecstatic speech--is not a distinguishing mark of "spiritual"

1. For the neuter *πνευματικά* see also 9.11 and 14.1; in 14.12 a good case can be made for *πνευματικῶν* (Ppc g m syP sa) instead of *πνευμάτων*. I see no merit in Schmithals' argument that 14.1 is an interpolation; see Gnosis, p. 163.

Christians at all. It is a phenomenon that is known among pagans as well--perhaps had even played a part in the Gentile Christians' own previous religious background--and which can even be used as a demonic vehicle by which the demons can vent their curses against Jesus Christ. Conversely, from the very fact that it is only the Spirit of God who can lead men to a confession of Jesus as Lord, all Christians, all who participate in the congregational confession of faith in Jesus as Lord, are in effect speaking "in the Spirit of God." Therefore there can be no distinctions made in the congregation between those with "spiritual" gifts and those without "spiritual" gifts, for it is a gift of the Holy Spirit itself to be able to confess Jesus as Lord.

So, Paul argues, there is only one Spirit, and all Christians share this Spirit by virtue of their baptism and common confession. The expression ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς is to be understood as a Pauline antithesis¹ to the common

1. See now also J. Sweet, "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia," NTS 13 (1966/67), 251 f.; and K. Maly, "1 Kor 12,1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?" BZ 10 (1966), 92. It is possible that this striking expression was influenced by Paul's interpretation of Deut. 21.23; cf. Gal. 3.13. For a Jew, death by crucifixion would conjure up the "curse" of Deut. 21.23. This seems to be the case in 4QpNah I.7 f., on which see Maly, ibid., p. 94.

Christians at all. It is a phenomenon that is known among pagans as well--perhaps had even played a part in the Gentile Christians' own previous religious background--and which can even be used as a demonic vehicle by which the demons can vent their curses against Jesus Christ. Conversely, from the very fact that it is only the Spirit of God who can lead men to a confession of Jesus as Lord, all Christians, all who participate in the congregational confession of faith in Jesus as Lord, are in effect speaking "in the Spirit of God." Therefore there can be no distinctions made in the congregation between those with "spiritual" gifts and those without "spiritual" gifts, for it is a gift of the Holy Spirit itself to be able to confess Jesus as Lord.

So, Paul argues, there is only one Spirit, and all Christians share this Spirit by virtue of their baptism and common confession. The expression ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς is to be understood as a Pauline antithesis¹ to the common

1. See now also J. Sweet, "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia," *NTS* 13 (1966/67), 251 f.; and K. Maly, "1 Kor 12,1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?" *BZ* 10 (1966), 92. It is possible that this striking expression was influenced by Paul's interpretation of Deut. 21.23; cf. Gal. 3.13. For a Jew, death by crucifixion would conjure up the "curse" of Deut. 21.23. This seems to be the case in 4QpNah I.7 f., on which see Maly, *ibid.*, p. 94.

Christian confession, an antithetical expression used to shock the Corinthian enthusiasts into placing the phenomenon of ecstatic "prophecy" into a proper perspective, to see it as a possible vehicle for demons as well as for the Spirit, and to understand that this is not by any means a distinguishing mark of "spiritual" Christianity.

In 12.4 ff. Paul goes on to explain that there is one Spirit, but there is given to all Christians different gifts of the Spirit by which, acting in concert, the whole body of Christians can be built up and strengthened. γένη γλωσσῶν and ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν are gifts of the Spirit, but they are noticeably placed last in Paul's list.

Chapter VI

GENESIS 2.7 IN Gnostic EXEGESIS

Introduction

It has already been shown, in previous chapters, that the πνεῦμα-ψυχή, πνευματικός-ψυχικός contrast develops out of a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 (in the Greek text). The πνοή of 2.7a is regarded as identical with the πνεῦμα, and constitutes the heavenly and immortal part of man.

This chapter carries this further and explores the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology in Gnostic texts and its relation to the Gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7. Genesis 2.7 is a focal text for gnostic speculation (a fact which, nevertheless, has not heretofore been noticed by scholars).¹ This chapter can thus be considered to

1. For example, in the scriptural index to Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, Gen. 2.7 does not appear at all.

supplement what has been discovered by others concerning gnostic exegesis of another important passage in Genesis, i.e. 1.26f.¹

Actually the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology is not always employed in gnostic materials, and the gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is quite varied. What follows are the most important examples of how the various gnostic groups interpreted Genesis 2.7, and how the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology, when it is used, fits into the context of Genesis 2.7 exegesis.

The Apocryphon of John

The bulk of this document is essentially a "commentary" on the text of the opening chapters of Genesis.² Using the version from the Berlin Codex

1. See especially J. Jervell, Imago Dei, pp. 122-170, and H.-M. Schenke, Der Gott Mensch in der Gnosis (Göttingen, 1962).

2. See now A. Kragerud, "Apocryphon Johannis. En formanalyse," NTT 16 (1965), 15-38; especially helpful is the table given on p. 34, wherein the various portions of AJ are set beside the relevant verses in Gen. On the "commentary" character of AJ, see also N. Petersen, "The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard, 1967), pp. 104 ff.;

(= BG)¹ as a basis, we find that the passage which interprets Genesis 2.7 runs from 48.14 to 52.1. The parallel passage in Codex II from Nag Hammadi² is 63.5-67.33, with 63.29-67.10 representing an expansion not found in BG.

In the context immediately preceding BG 48.14, the creator-archons say to one another,

Let us create a man according to the image and appearance of God.³

The "commentary" jumps immediately to Genesis 2.7, as can be seen from the language in which the creation of man is depicted:

They created from themselves and from all their powers, they formed a formation (αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν δυνάμεων) from themselves. And [each one] of [all the powers created from] the power [the soul].⁴

and S. Giversen, "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis," Studia Theologica 17 (1963), 60-76.

1. W. Till (ed.), Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (TU 60.5; Berlin, 1955); hereafter cited as BG (Berolinensis Gnosticus).

2. On the numbering of the Nag-Hammadi codices, it is now becoming common usage to follow Krause in Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo 18 (1962), 121-132. Abbreviations are, e.g., C (= "Codex") II, C III, etc.

3. BG 48.11-14; cf. Gen. 1.26a. In C II Jaldabaoth addresses the other powers.

4. BG 48.14-49.2. Till's text from 48.17-49.2, in

It is clear from this passage, and from what follows, that we have to do here with the creation of man's soul by the archons. The fall of Adam into materiality is treated only in 52.15-17 and following.¹ The words ἀπλασσα, πλάσμα, and τεψιχη are all derived from the Greek text of Genesis 2.7:

καὶ ἔπλασεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐγένετο
ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν

It is this "psychic" creature which fulfills the exhortation in the immediately preceding context (Gen. 1.26); the text in the lines immediately following refer back to Genesis 1.27:

They created it (ἀρταμιος, fem., i.e. the ψυχή) according to the image which they had seen, by way of an imitation (κατὰ οὐμιμῆσιν)² of the one who was from the beginning, the perfect Man (πιτελιος ἄρωμε). They said, "Let us call him Adam so that the name of this (being) and his power may become for us a light (νόσσειν)."³

spite of the lacunae, is established on the basis of C III. The reading in C II is somewhat different.

1. Cf. 55.2 ff., where reference is made to "another formation" (ἀκεπλάσις).

2. A Platonic idea though used in an un-Platonic way. See Plato, *Timaeus* 48e, for example, on the relationship between παράδειγμα and μίμημα; cf. also 28b ff.

3. BG 49.2-9. Cf. C II: . . . νόσσειν νόσσειν, "a power of light."

This passage is an interpretation of the εἰκὼν of Genesis 1.27. In the Apocryphon of John Anthropos is the highest God.¹ Jaldabaoth,² the abortive product of Sophia, had surveyed his creative work, and had declared, "I am a jealous God, and beside me there is no other" (BG 44.14 f.; cf. Ex. 20.5; Is. 45.5,6; 46.9). The Mother (Sophia) realizes her deficiency and repents, and a voice comes to her, "There exists the Man, and the Son of Man" (BG 47.15 f.). Jaldabaoth and the other archons see in the water an image (εἰκὼν) of the Man, i.e. the highest God, and resolve to imitate it, thereby to illuminate their own darkness. Their psychic creation they resolve to call "Adam," in order to capture the magic of this name for themselves.³

1. Cf. BG 22.9, and especially BG 47.14 ff.

2. On Jaldabaoth, see W. Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis (Göttingen, 1907), pp. 351-355, where the planetary aspect of Jaldabaoth and the seven archons is discussed. The name "Jaldabaoth" is probably to be translated, "Child of Chaos," as was suggested by A. Hilgenfeld, Die Ketzer-geschichte des Urchristentums (Leipzig, 1884; r. p. Darmstadt, 1963), p. 238. See now, for an explicit connection between Jaldabaoth and chaos, the Untitled Text from C II, 151.24, where Ialdabaoth is addressed as a child of the abyss, i.e. chaos (τῆς ἀβύσσου). The meaning "child of chaos" (ⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ) is supported also by Frank Cross of Harvard (in an oral communication).

3. On the εἰκὼν doctrine in AJ, see especially H.-M. Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, pp. 32-43; I find myself in basic agreement with his conclusions.

What follows in the text is a further elaboration of the work of the creator-archons in fashioning man's soul. At this point there are two different versions. In BG each of the creator-angels is referred to as a $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$.¹ In C II each of the angels creates a different feature of man's soul.² I present first the text of BG 49.9-51.1:

And the powers ($\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$) began from below. The first is Deity, a soul of bone; the second is Lordship,³ a sinew-soul; the third is Fire, a soul of flesh ($\sigma\tau\psi\chi\eta$ $\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$); the fourth is Pronoia, a soul of marrow and the whole constitution of the body; the fifth is Kingdom, a soul of blood; the sixth is Understanding, a soul of skin; the seventh is Sophia, a soul of hair. And they adorned the whole body. And their angels came to them from (among) those who had been prepared at first by the powers. (And they received)⁴ the hypostases of soul ($\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$ $\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$ $\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$) for the ordering of the joint-members. And they created the entire body, joined together from the multitude of angels which I mentioned at first. And it remained inert a long time, for the seven powers were unable to raise it up, nor could the 360 angels who had put together the joint-members.

The same passage in C II reads as follows:

-
1. This version is paralleled in C III 22.18 ff.
 2. This version is paralleled in C IV 24.2 ff.
 3. Following Till's emendation of $\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$ to $\bar{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$;
cf. also C II 63.18.
 4. Cf. C II 63.24 f.

And the powers ($\bar{\nu}\Delta\gamma\bar{\nu}\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$) began. The first, Goodness ($\tau\eta\bar{\nu}\tau\chi\rho\eta\varsigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$), created a soul of bone; the second, Pronoia, created a soul of sinew; the third, Deity, created a soul of flesh; the fourth, Lordship ($\tau\eta\bar{\nu}\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$), created a soul of marrow; the fifth, Kingdom, created a soul of blood; the sixth, Zeal ($\pi\kappa\omega\acute{\epsilon}$), created a soul of skin; the seventh, Wisdom ($\tau\eta\bar{\nu}\tau\rho\omega\bar{\nu}\eta\tau\eta$), created a soul of hair. And the multitude of angels stood up before it. They received from the Powers ($\nu\epsilon\acute{\zeta}\omicron\tau\iota\varsigma$) the seven psychic hypostases¹ in order to make the joining of the limbs and the joining of the pieces and the synthesis of the adornment of each of the members² And all the angels and demons worked until they had adorned the psychic body ($\mu\psi\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\ \bar{\nu}\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$), but their entire work was inert and motionless for a long time (67.10-14).

Though these texts are slightly different, they both refer to the creation of the soul, or the "psychic body," of man.³ In so far as they are working with $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$

1. Taking $\bar{\nu}\tau\varsigma\alpha\omega\gamma\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\theta\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\tau\epsilon\ \psi\chi\iota\kappa\eta$ as object of the verb $\delta\gamma\lambda\iota$, as does Giversen in his translation, Apocryphon Johannis (Acta Theologica Danica 5; Copenhagen, 1963), p. 75.

2. At this point there occurs in C II a very long section describing how each of the 365 angels (though the full number is not represented) contributed a part to the psychic body of man. The angels are given various names, most of them sounding more like Egyptian names than Hebrew or Aramaic (according to Thomas Lambdin, in an oral communication). This section runs from 63.29-67.10.

3. The reference in these passages to $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ is a remnant of an earlier tradition concerning the creation by the angels of man's body. See below, p.151.

they themselves are referred to as "souls," and their "hypostasis" is a psychic "hypostasis." I have hesitated to translate ὑπόστασις with the usual (Latin cognate) "substance." What seems to be meant by ὑπόστασις is something like "underlying basic reality" ("zugrunde liegende Wirklichkeit").¹⁾

The description of the work of the seven powers in creating the various parts of the body (bone, sinew, marrow, flesh, etc.) may stem from a Jewish wisdom tradition such as is reflected also in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, especially at Testament of Reuben 2-3, where the seven πνεύματα given to man in creation are enumerated; the seven πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης are considered as resident in various parts of the body.

There may also be in the Apocryphon of John some distant reflection of a speculation on Plato's Timaeus. At Timaeus 69C ff. there is a description of the activity of the created gods in fashioning the various parts of the body of man which will house the immortal element of the soul created by the Demiurge himself.

1. I am indebted to Prof. Koester for allowing me to see part of his article on ὑπόστασις in TWBNT, to be published in the spring of 1968. I owe the reference to the Testament of Reuben to him as well.

That we are dealing here with an involved commentary upon Genesis 2.7 is confirmed by the passage immediately following, wherein we are informed of the origin of man's πνεῦμα. The text continues:

And the Mother wished to get back the power (τόση, C II: ΤΑΙΝΔΜΙC) which she had given to the archon of Prounikos. She came in innocence; begged the Father of All rich in mercy, the God of Light. He sent by a holy decree the Autogenes¹ and the four lights (ἈΠΙΔΥΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ Μῆ ΠΕΥΤΟΟΡ ΝΟΓΟΪΝ, C II: Ἄτορ Ἀφωστηρ, "the five light-bearers") in the form of the angels of the first archon. They advised him so that they might bring forth from him the power of the mother. They said to him, "Breathe into his face from the spirit (πνεῦμα) that is in you, and the thing (φωβ) will rise up." And he breathed upon him from his spirit, which is the power from the Mother, into the body, and it immediately moved (BG 51.1-52.1 = C II 67.15-33).

Compare the end of this passage in the C II version:

And he blew into him his spirit, which is the power of his Mother; he did not know, because he was in ignorance. And the power of the mother went out from Altabaoth into the psychic body which they had made for him according to the image of him who was from the beginning. The body moved, and received strength, and shone.

The sequel to this passage describes how as a result of this inbreathing the man was stronger and wiser than all of the archons, who thereupon became jealous and cast man down into the lower depths of materiality.

1. (= Christus); cf. BG 32.9.

For our purposes, it is important to point out how the account in the Apocryphon of John of the reception by man of his spiritual nature is based upon an interpretation of Genesis 2.7, especially: καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν (= πνεῦμα) ζωῆς. The πνεῦμα has been placed over against the ψυχή, the ψυχικός nature of man. The πνεῦμα is the heavenly part of man, derived from the Mother (Sophia) and ultimately from the Pleroma, whereas the ψυχή is a creation of Ialdabaoth and his creator-angels. Though the adjective πνευματικός does not occur in Apocryphon of John, the term ψυχικός¹ is used--but only in the immediate context of the gnostic commentary upon Genesis 2.7.

The πνεῦμα-ψυχή contrast does not play any role in the editorial framework of Apocryphon of John, nor are gnostic men distinguished from non-gnostic men on the basis of a πνευματικός-ψυχικός differentiation. The gnostic class of men is referred to as the "unwavering generation," and the non-gnostics are regarded as having

1. In C II 63.9,26; 67.5,12,30; 68.14; cf. C IV 23.26. The adjective χοϊκός does not occur in AJ, nor is anything made of the phrase in Gen. 2.7, χούν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

a "counterfeit spirit" ($\Delta\alpha\tau\iota\mu\iota\mu\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu\ \bar{\mu}\pi\bar{\nu}\delta$).¹ This terminology is not explicitly related to the Genesis exegesis delineated above, though of course it presupposes that the gnostic men have the true $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$.

The passage here treated is a highly-developed mythopoeic synthesis of several Jewish traditions of Genesis exegesis. These include (1) the Hellenistic-Jewish distinction between the higher $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and the lower $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ based on the Greek text of Genesis 2.7 (discussed above), (2) the tradition (probably Palestinian)² that Adam was created as a "formless mass" (gölem) into which God breathed his life-giving breath, and (3) the Hellenistic-Jewish tradition (interpreting Gen. 1.26) that God relegated the creation of man's body to the angels.³ All of these traditions of exegesis are widely taken over and

1. On the "unwavering generation" (BG 22.12-17; 75.20; etc.) see N. Petersen's dissertation, "The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John," pp. 122 ff., and the literature cited there. For a still-useful discussion of various gnostic classifications of men, see R. Liechtenhan, Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus, pp. 84 ff., and E. Schweizer's article on $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in TWBNT VI.

2. Because based on the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. On the rabbinic doctrine of the golem, see below.

3. See below.

variously interpreted in gnostic literature. The Apocryphon of John reflects a continuing stage in an already gnosticized synthesis. What makes these speculations "gnostic" is not the traditions themselves, but how they are interpreted and reformulated in the gnostic context and with the gnostic intentionality.¹

The speculation that God addressed the angels when he said "Let us make man" (Gen. 1.26) is attested in Justin's Dialogue with Trypho 62, where he rejects this doctrine, along with the concomitant teaching that the body of man is the creation of the angels (ὅτι ἀγγέλων ποίημα ἦν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον). The earliest extant witness to this doctrine is Philo, who states it no less than three times (Op. 72-75; Conf. 168 ff.; Fug. 68 ff.), and that in the interest of preventing one from ascribing to the transcendent and holy God the making of a mixed

1. See my remarks on "Gnosticism" in Chapter One. Note that these speculations are based on Jewish traditions, and, of course, the Jewish scripture. The AJ, for example, must have many more reflections of Jewish tradition. Cf. e.g. the sequel to the passage treated above, where Adam is stronger and wiser than all the creator-angels. To this should be compared the rabbinic tradition concerning the "image," interpreted to mean that Adam was larger, more glorious, and wiser than all the angels, Genesis Rabba 17.4. On this see Jervell, Imago Dei, p. 96.

creature such as man. More precisely, God fashioned man's immortal element, but delegated to the "powers" or "angels" subsidiary to him the creation of man's body, the seat of the vices.¹ For the origin of this doctrine one can point to a direct influence from Plato's Timaeus 41A, wherein it is stated that the body of man is fashioned by lower beings ("gods" in Plato, "powers" or "angels" in Philo), but that the immortal soul is created directly by the Demiurge (Timaeus 41D).

It is not difficult to see how such speculations on Genesis 1.26 by Philo and other exegetes could be interpreted with a gnostic twist. Such Genesis-speculations, indeed, are the primary building-blocks for the fabrication of gnostic myths and systems.

Adam as Gōlem in Rabbinic Tradition

According to a tradition of exegesis of Genesis 2.7 current in the rabbinic schools at least from the second century, Adam was first created as a "shapeless

1. Cf. the reference to the seven πνεύματα and the vices of man from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, cited above, p. 148.

mass" (אֶבֶן). The Midrash on Genesis 2.7 comments as follows:

This teaches that he set him up as a lifeless mass (אֶבֶן) reaching from earth to heaven and then infused a soul into him.¹

And again:

R. Tanhuma in the name of R. Banayah and R. Berekiah in the name of R. Leazar said: He created him as a lifeless mass (אֶבֶן) extending from one end of the world to the other; thus it is written, "Thine eyes did see mine unformed substance" (Ps. 139.16).²

The latter passage is particularly important, for it provides us with a key to the origin of the description of Adam as a golem, and it gives us an indication that this tradition is relatively early. On the latter point, the attribution of this doctrine to Banayah and Leazar puts us at least back to the second century, for both of these sages were Tannaim. As to the use of the term golem, it occurs only once in the Old Testament, at Psalm 139.16, where it says of Adam,³

1. Genesis Rabba 14.8, Soncino ed., p. 116; text Albeck ed., p. 132.

2. Genesis Rabba 8.1, Soncino ed., p. 54; Albeck, p. 55.

3. In the Jewish tradition this psalm was regularly put into the mouth of Adam. See G. Scholem, "Die

Thy eyes beheld my unformed substance (וְלֹא־יָדָעְתִּי);
in thy book were written, every one of them, the
days that were formed for me, when as yet there
was none of them.¹

One further text, of many that could be adduced,²
contains the following, put into the mouth of R. Acha
b. Chanina:³

The day consisted of twelve hours. In the first
hour, his [Adam's] dust was gathered; in the
second, it was kneaded into a shapeless mass; in
the third, his limbs were shaped; in the fourth,
a soul was infused into him; in the fifth he
arose and stood on his feet; in the sixth, he
gave [the animals] their names; in the seventh,
Eve became his mate; in the eighth, they ascended
to bed as two and descended as four;⁴ in the

Vorstellung von Golem in ihren tellurischen und magischen
Beziehungen," Eranos Jahrbuch 22 (Zürich, 1953), 240.

1. The word occurs only here in the O. T. RSV trans-
lation. The other idea, that Adam extended from earth to
heaven (or from one end of the world to the other) is also
read out of Scripture, from Deut. 4.32: $\text{אֵלֶּיךָ הָיָה אֲדָמָה וְאֶרֶץ}$
 $\text{וְשָׁמַיָּם וְכָל־הָאֲדָמָה וְכָל־הָאֲרָץ וְכָל־הָאֲשֵׁר־בָּהֶן}$
 $\text{וְכָל־הָאֲשֵׁר־בָּהֶן}$. Cf. b. Sanh. 38b,
where Deut. 4.32 is quoted in connection with this tra-
dition. Adam's reduction in size is derived from Ps. 139.5,
and connected to his fall into sin. On the latter, see
G. Scholem, Eranos Jb., p. 240; cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and
Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1962), p. 45.

2. See the enumeration of texts in Jervell, Imago Dei,
p. 105, and the literature cited there.

3. So Scholem, p. 239.

4. I.e., with Cain and his twin sister; cf. Yeb 62a,
cited on p. 242 of Soncino ed. in a note.

ninth, he was commanded not to eat of the tree; in the tenth, he sinned; in the eleventh, he was tried; and in the twelfth, he was expelled [from Eden] and departed, for it is written, "Man abideth not in honour."¹

Our interest centers upon the second and fourth hours in R. Acha's schema: Adam is first a lifeless mass ($\aleph \aleph \aleph$), and then is animated by the inbreathing into him of his soul ($\aleph \aleph \psi$).² This colorful tradition concerning the creation of Adam³ is to be found in the background of many gnostic accounts, including the one treated above from the Apocryphon of John.⁴ But in the gnostic sources, it is because of the basic inferiority

1. Soncino ed., p. 242, quotation from Ps. 49.12 (Heb. 49.13).

2. On the interpretation of the rabbinic doctrine of the golem, see Jervell, pp. 105 ff., and especially G. Scholem's article cited above. Jervell's arguments, that this doctrine underscores the collectivity of Adam's person, I find quite convincing.

3. In this tradition, as in others discussed by the rabbis, I think we should allow for a bit of humor. The study of Torah was, for the sages, not a burden but sheer joy.

4. See esp. BG 50.15-19; C II 67.10-14. Cf. also Brandenburger, Adam und Christus, pp. 89 ff., and p. 85, n. 2, where he remarks concerning the rabbinic golem speculation that "gnostische Vorstellungen stehen damit--wie auch immer, sei es nehmend oder gebend--in Verbindung." Nothing further is said on the origins of this speculation in rabbinic tradition; furthermore, he has missed the importance of Gen. 2.7 in his discussion of the evidence.

of the creator (or creator-powers) that the body of Adam lies inert and unable to move. The essential life-principle is breathed into him from a source ultimately higher than and superior to the creator(s), and is that which enables man to rise above his creaturely existence and even to despise his creator(s). This is the pattern in the Apocryphon of John--where, however, the distinction has already been made between the $\psi\chi\eta$ and the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ --and it is the pattern in many other gnostic texts as well, some of them reflecting earlier stages in the development of the tradition in gnostic circles.

Saturninus

Probably the earliest stage¹ in the gnostic reinterpretation of this tradition of Genesis 2.7 exegesis is that represented by Saturninus.² Irenaeus records the

1. So far as our extant materials permit us to determine. See here also K. Rudolph, "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation," ZRGG 9 (1957), 7; and G. Quispel, "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," Eranos-Jahrbuch 22 (1953), 202.

2. And probably Menander; cf. Tertullian, de carnis resurrectione 5: "Futile et frivolum istud corpusculum, quod malum denique appellare non horrent, etsi angelorum

following concerning the heresy of Saturninus (or Satornilus, as he is sometimes called):

Saturninus, like Menander, set forth one Father, unknown to all, who created the angels,¹ arch-angels, powers, and authorities. By seven of the angels was made the world, and all things in it. And man was created by the angels, when a luminous image appeared below from the highest power. When they were unable to grasp it (he says), for it immediately darted upward again, they exhorted one another saying, "Let us make man according to the image and likeness." When he was fashioned, and the creature was not able to stand erect, due to the feebleness of the angels (et non potuisset erigi plasma propter imbecillitatem angelorum),² but wriggled like a worm (quasi vermiculus scarizaret), the power from above,³ taking pity on him because he was made in its⁴ image, sent forth a spark of light

fuisse operatio, ut Menandro et Marco placet" "Marcus" is probably not the Valentinian of the same name. Rudolph pushes the tradition back to Simon Magus; ZRGG 9 (1957), 7.

1. Though not explicitly represented, one must posit the interposition here of a female principle corresponding to Simon's (and Menander's) *ἐννοια*.

2. Cf. Hippolytus Ref. 7.28.3: καὶ μὴ δυναμένου ἀνορθοῦσθαι τοῦ πλάσματος διὰ τὸ ἀδρανὲς τῶν ἀγγέλων.

3. Cf. Ibid.

4. "His" or "her"? Cf. AJ where Wisdom, the Mother, is the agent. But in the system of Simon and Menander--and perhaps now also in Saturninus--*ἡ ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμις* is a fatherly principle, the *πρῶτος θεός*. Cf. Justin 1 Apol. 26.3; and on Simon and Menander, see H. Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin, 1954), p. 69.

(scintillam vitae = σπινθήρ τῆς ζωῆς) which raised the man erect, gave him limbs, and caused him to come to life.¹

This myth contains a re-interpretation of two of the Jewish traditions mentioned above, the creation of man's body by the angels (Gen. 1.26 f.) and the speculation based on Genesis 2.7 that man was formed as a shapeless, inert mass, and vivified by the inbreathing of God. The curious idea that the πλάσμα of the angels "wriggled like a worm" (cf. Hippolytus, Ref. 7.28.3, ὡς σκώληκος σκαρίζοντος) may not only be a picturesque extension of the idea of Adam as an inert golem, but may represent a separate Jewish tradition. This has been stated by G. Quispel, though without supporting evidence.² R. M. Grant is probably on the right track in his suggestion that

1. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 1.24.1 = Harvey ed., 1.17.

2. See Eranos Jb 22, p. 205, where he refers in a note to an article by E. Preuschen, "Die Apokryphen gnostischen Adam-Schriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht," in Festgruss Bernhard Stade (Giessen, 1900), p. 227. Preuschen, in treating the creation of man by Jaldabaoth and the angels in the Sethian-Ophite system (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.30) as "ein riesenförmiges Monstrum, das sich nur kriechend bewegen kann," states in a note that this is "eine jüdische Fabeli," referring to Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judentum I (1700), 365 ff. But Eisenmenger's collection of material sheds no further light, besides referring to the usual rabbinic texts describing Adam as a golem, or as two-faced (Ps. 139.5!).

Saturninus may have derived this from Psalm 22.7, applying the passage to Adam: ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (LXX 21.7).¹ But I would suggest that Psalm 22.7 had already been applied to Adam in Jewish tradition before Saturninus, in a manner analogous to the use of Psalm 139.16. We now have some evidence from Qumran that points in this direction. A verse from one of the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH XI.12) reads as follows:

. . . that the worm of the dead may be raised
from the dust to thy eternal counsel²

The "worm" (𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕), the same word used in Ps. 22.7, and translated in the LXX σκώληξ) is in this Qumran hymn a reference to mortal man. Influence from Psalm 22.7 (perhaps also from Job 25.6) I find to be quite probable.

Saturninus' myth is thoroughly "gnostic"; the creator-angels (of whom the Jewish God is one)³ are inferior beings working independently of the highest God, and the

1. R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (rev. ed.; New York, 1966), p. 101.

2. I have used the edition of Lohse, which is based on the editio princeps published by E. L. Sukenik (Jerusalem, 1954).

3. Cf. 1.24.2: Et Judaeorum Deum unum ex angelis esse ait.

essential immortal essence of man is derived not from his creator(s) but from a higher power. It is this "spark of life"--essentially identical to God--which must be retrieved and saved.

Absent from the system of Saturninus, however, is the differentiation of πνεῦμα, πνευματικός and ψυχή, ψυχικός. The πνοή ζωής of Genesis 2.7 is referred to as a σπινθήρ ζωής,¹ which alone is immortal and which is placed over against the bodily creation of the angel-powers. This doctrine functions in the system of Saturninus to distinguish between classes of men, based on whether or not they possess the "spark of life" and are thus ὁμόφυλοι with the highest power (Hipp. Ref. 7.28.4). The sign of this "spark" is faith in Christ (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.24.2)!

Can one attribute these speculations of Saturninus to earlier gnostic teachers, e.g. to Simon Magus? Though Saturninus is the first actually to incorporate Christ into his system,² the tradition of the creation of man by

1. Cf. Epiphanius Pan. 23.1.8, speaking of Saturninus: δῆθεν τὸν σπινθήρα ψυχὴν τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φάσκων. Already in Wis. Sol. 2.2-3 the πνοή of Gen. 2.7 is put into parallel with σπινθήρ and πνεῦμα; see above, p. 54.

2. Simon claims to be the "Great Power" himself; Menander claims to be a savior sent from above; cf. Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.23.

the angels and the inbreathing from above of his "spark of life" may perhaps go back to Simon.¹ But if it does² there is little extant evidence, apart from a statement attributed to Simon by Epiphanius³ to the effect that he created the angels through the mediation of Ennoia, and the angels created the world and man.

Simonian Gnosticism

Genesis 2.7 is treated exegetically in an important Simonian source, though in a manner quite unlike that we have seen in Saturninus and Apocryphon of John. The exegesis occurs in the context of a commentary, preserved by Hippolytus (Ref. 6.9.3-6.18.7), on a revelatory document

1. So K. Rudolph; cf. above, p.157, n.2. Cf. here Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.24.1: "Ex iis (i.e. Simon and Menander) Saturninus . . . et Basilides . . ." One must, of course, take with a grain of salt the attempt of the heresiologists to make personal connections between the great heretical teachers.

2. J. Jervell, Imago Dei, p. 143, n. 83, denies that Simon taught that the angels created man.

3. . . . "Ἐννοίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ καὶ Προϋνικός, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον καλουμένη, δι' ἧς τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἐκτίσα, οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι τὸν κόσμον ἐκτίσαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, Pan. 21.2.4.

ascribed to Simon Magus and entitled Megale Apophasis ("The Great Proclamation").¹ The material is highly syncretistic and philosophized, and probably quite late (end of the second century?).²

Genesis 2.7a is quoted at Refutatio 6.14.4 f.:

This is³ the seventh power⁴ concerning which Moses says, 'καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος' [Gen. 1.2], i.e. the πνεῦμα which holds all things in itself, the image (εἰκὼν) of the unbounded power, concerning which Simon says,

1. The title occurs in Hipp. Ref. 6.11, ἐν τῇ 'Αποφάσει τῇ μεγάλῃ; cf. Ref. 5.9.5 where the Naassenes cite the same document as 'Απόφασις τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως.

2. It reflects the Heraclitic-Stoic doctrine of fire, the Platonic dualism of νοητόν and αἰσθητόν, the Aristotelian distinction between δύναμις and ἐνεργεία, the doctrine of Empedocles that like is known by like, Pythagorean speculations, and at the same time contains a plethora of quotations from the O. T., N. T., and Homer. See esp. E. Haenchen, "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" ZTK 49 (1952), 336. It should be remarked here that Haenchen, in his very fine article, does not in my opinion distinguish enough between the quotations from "Simon" and the Simonian commentary; he thus finds it necessary to deny that the Megale Apophasis can go back to Simon, a matter which perhaps should be left open. The Megale Apophasis itself is apparently quoted in three places in Hippolytus: Ref. 6.9.4; 14.4; and 18.2-7.

3. Omitting φησὶν here and elsewhere; also παρ' αὐτοῖς below.

4. The emanation of νοῦς and ἐπίνοια (οὐρανός and γῆ as allegorized in ch. 13), and further delineated as ἔστως, σίας, and σιησόμενος. In 14.3 the seventh power is identified with the με of Prov. 8.23,25 (Wisdom).

'εἰκὼν ἐξ ἀφθάρτου μορφῆς. κοσμοῦσα μόνη πάντα.'
 For this power, which hovers over the water,
 originating from an incorruptible form, alone
 orders all things (κοσμεῖ μόνη πάντα). When some
 such construction of the world had taken place
 'God formed man' taking 'dust from the earth.'
 He formed (him) not simple but two-fold (οὐχ
 ἀπλοῦν ἀλλὰ διπλοῦν) 'according to the image and
 according to the likeness' (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ'
 ὁμοίωσιν).

Genesis 2.7a is used in conjunction with Genesis
 1.2 and 1.26. The ἐβδόμη δύναμις which resides in all men
 as the power that "stands, has come to stand, and will
 stand,"¹ is related via the εἰκὼν and ὁμοίωσις to the
 Spirit which hovered over the waters of creation. The
 second part of Genesis 2.7 is not quoted, and no reference
 is made to the ἐμφύσημα of the πνοὴ ζωῆς.

By the διπλοῦς² nature of man, κατ' εἰκόνα and
 καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, is meant man as having fallen into the
 world of becoming (cf. στάς κάτω ἐν τῇ βοῇ τῶν ὑδάτων
 ἐν εἰκόνι γεννηθείς, 17.1) and man from the standpoint of
 his salvation (cf. στησόμενος ἄνω παρὰ τὴν μακαρίαν
 ἀπέραντον δύναμιν, εἰς ἐξεικονισθῆ . . . ὁ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν
 ἀναπεπλασμένος τέλειος ἐπουράνιος, 17.1 f.) Salvation is

1. On this formula see Haenchen, ZTK 49, pp. 330 f.

2. Cf. Poimandres 15: . . . διπλοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος. θνητὸς
 μὲν διὰ τὸ σῶμα, ἀθάνατος δὲ διὰ τὸν οὐσιώδη ἄνθρωπον.

accomplished when one "is fully formed" (ἐξεικονισθῇ) and thus becomes ἴσος καὶ ὅμοιος τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀπεράντῳ δυνάμει (16.5).¹ But if one does not achieve his full potentiality, he perishes with the world:

ὁ εἰ μὴ ἐξεικονισθῇ μετὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἀπολεῖται, δυνάμει μείναν μόνον καὶ μὴ ἐνεργείᾳ γενόμενον-- τοῦτό ἐστι . . . τὸ εἰρηζόμενον· ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν (14.6, quoting 1 Cor. 11.32).

Salvation resides as a potential force (δύναμις)² in all men, and need only be brought to full ἐνεργείᾳ by a process of self-realization, aided by the "right word" (ὁ προσηκὼν λόγος = the Simonian teaching) and the "place of the Lord" (τόπος κυρίου = the Simonian community).³

Genesis 2.7a is quoted again in 14.7: πῶς οὖν καὶ τίνα τρόπον . . . πλάσσει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ θεός; The answer: ἐν παραδείσῳ (Gen. 2.8). There follows an allegory on Genesis 2.8 ff. in which παράδεισος is equated with the womb (cf. Is. 44.2), and which employs the latest

1. Cf. the Valentinian doctrine of μὶμῶσις, on which see F. Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne (Paris, 1947), pp. 400 ff.

2. Other terms: ἀμέριστος στιγμή (14.6); cf. the Naassene use of Simonian material in Ref. 5.9.5 ff.; and σπινθήρ ἐλάχιστος (17.7). The latter term may offer a point of contact with Saturninus.

3. Haenchen, ZTK 49, p. 333.

medical science on embryology.¹

In summary² the Simonian use of Genesis 2.7 is quite unique; there is no trace of the traditions we found in Saturninus. Furthermore, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology does not occur in Simonian Gnosticism. Thus, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology seems to occur only if Genesis 2.7 is interpreted accordingly, which is not the case in Simon.

Sethian-Ophites

The Sethian-Ophite³ system as described by

1. I.e. Galen; cf. Wendland's notes to this passage in the GCS ed., and Haenchen's remark (p. 328, n. 2): "Das dürfte für die Altersbestimmung der Gr. V. wichtig sein"; to this see p. 163, n. 2.

2. For further material on Simon Magus, see especially J. Jervell, Imago Dei, pp. 143-147; H. Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, pp. 70 ff., in addition to Haenchen's article in ZTK.

3. The exact relationship between "Sethian" and "Ophite" Gnosticism is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. The characterization "Sethian-Ophite" is based on Theodoret of Cyrus, Haereticorum Fabularum Compendium 1.14 (cf. Harvey ed. of Irenaeus, I, 226), who is in his work largely dependent upon Irenaeus: οἱ δὲ Σεθιανοὶ οὕς 'Οφίανους ἢ 'Οφίτας τινὲς ὀνομάζουσιν The Latin text of Irenaeus has simply "Alii" (1.30.1 = Harvey 1.28).

Irenaeus (in Adv. Haer. 1.30) contains a Genesis 2.7 exegesis which is somewhat similar to that of the Apocryphon of John. The system as a whole seems to be a modified--essentially more Christianized--version of that which underlies the Apocryphon of John.

This Genesis 2.7 commentary occurs in 1.30.6. In the preceding context Jaldabaoth has boasted, "I am Father and God, and there is no one above me."¹ "The Mother" (Sophia-Prounikos, 1.30.3) rebukes Jaldabaoth with the words, "Do not lie, Ialdabaoth, there exists above you the Father of all, the First Man, and Man, son of Man." Ialdabaoth thereupon says to the other powers, "Come, let us make man according to our image."² Our text continues at this point:

The six powers heard this, and since the Mother was giving them the idea of man (*excogitationem hominis*) in order that through him she might empty them of their original power, they came together and fashioned (*formaverunt* = ἐπλασαν) a man of immense dimensions in breadth and length. But since he was only wriggling (*scarizante autem eo tantum*)³ they brought him

1. Cf. AJ, BG 44.14, and above, p. 145.

2. Compare and contrast AJ, BG 48.11-14; cf. above, p. 143.

3. Cf. Saturninus in Hipp. Ref. 7.28.3: ὡς σκώληκος σκαρίζοντος and above, p. 158.

to his father. Sophia was operating in this way in order that she might empty him of the moisture of light (humectatione luminis), that he might not be able to raise himself up against those who are above by having power. He was¹ secretly emptied of his power when he breathed into man the breath of life (Illo autem insufflante in hominem spiritum vitae). Thus man has nous and enthymesis (Nun et Enthymesis),² and it is these that partake of salvation. Immediately he gave thanks to the First Man, and abandoned those who had created him.

In this passage are certain elements that we have noted in the Apocryphon of John and Saturninus: the lifeless (or writhing) body of Adam created by Jaldabaoth and the angels, and the inbreathing by which man is endowed with his essential nature, superior to that of his creators, and which is eventually to be redeemed. As in Apocryphon of John this inbreathing derives ultimately from "the Mother" (i.e. Wisdom), and the inbreathing of this power into man by Ialdabaoth deprives him and the creator-archons of all the power they had received originally from the fallen Mother, Wisdom. The Jewish tradition of the immense size of the Adam-golem is here

1. Omitting "dicunt" here and in the next sentence.

2. Cf. the six roots or powers in the Simonian system: first νοῦς, and the sixth ἐνθύμησις (Hipp. Ref. 6.12.2). The totality of these is the ἑβδόμη δύναμις, ἑστῶς, σταῖς, στησόμενος (Ref. 6.13).

retained, though it had played no role in Apocryphon of John or in Saturninus.¹

The terminology by which the πνοή (πνεῦμα) ζωής of Genesis 2.7 is described is, however, different both from that in Apocryphon of John (πνεῦμα, δαμ = δύναμις) and in Saturninus (σπινθήρ ζωής). Though the term "power" does occur,² the technical term employed for this inbreathing is "moisture of light" (humectatio luminis), which embraces also nous and enthymesis. It is this "moisture of light" which has overflowed from the Pleroma from the "First Woman" (Upper Sophia) and has fallen from above, incorporated as Prounikos-Sophia (Cf. 1.30.3), and overflowing even into the son of Sophia-Prounikos, Ialdabaoth. Ialdabaoth is tricked into breathing this "moisture of light" into man, thus depriving himself of power, and initiating the possibility of salvation.

The system has become Christianized by the introduction of Jesus Christ, who now sits at the right hand of the ignorant Ialdabaoth, receiving the "holy souls"

1. Cf. above, p. 155 on this Jewish tradition.

2. In the phrase "uti non posset [Ialdabaoth] erigi adversus eos qui sursum [sunt], habens virtutem" (= δύναμις).

from the world:

For he (Jesus Christ) will not receive the holy souls (animae sanctae) only to send them back into the world; but (he will receive) only those who are of his substance (ex substantia eius), i.e. those who are from the inbreathing (ex insufflatione = ἐξ ἐμφυσήματος cf. ἐνέφυσεν, Gen. 2.7). The consummation will occur when the totality of the moisture of the spirit of light (humectatio spiritus luminis) will be collected, and carried away into the Aeon of incorruptibility (1.30.14 = Harvey 1.28.7).

In this system there is no terminological distinction between πνεῦμα and ψυχή, between πνευματικός and ψυχικός,¹ even though Genesis 2.7 (from which such a distinction in some systems does arise) plays a crucial role in the speculation of the "Sethian-Ophite" system.

The Mandaean Literature

In the Mandaean literature are to be found some of the traditions of Genesis-exegesis we have encountered above. In Book 3 of the right-hand Ginza² one

1. In 1.30.13 the resurrection body of Jesus is described as animale et spiritale, in distinction from the worldly elements (mundalia) which remain in the world. Cf. the Valentinian speculation on the nature of Jesus' resurrection-body.

2. Hereafter referred to as GR. The left-hand Ginza will be cited GL.

passage,¹ though greatly enlarged with specifically Mandaean motifs, bears a remarkable resemblance to the passages quoted above from the Apocryphon of John and Saturninus. Ptahil,² the Mandaean demiurge, addresses the Planets:³ "Wir wollen Adam schaffen dass er König über die Welt (𐌲𐌳𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰) sei."⁴ So they create Adam. He is the image (dmuta) of Ptahil and his father, the "Father of the Uthras."⁵ But he is lifeless, without a soul.

Doch obwohl sich alle darum bemühten, konnten sie ihn nicht auf die Füße stellen (𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰).⁶

Finally the lifeless body (𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰 𐌲𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰) is enlived with a soul (mānā) by Adakas-Mānā and Manda-d-Haiye,

1. Petermann ed., I, 100-102; Lidzbarski tr., pp. 107-111, as quoted by K. Rudolph, ZRGG 9, pp. 9-11.

2. On Ptahil see now K. Rudolph, Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften (FRLANT 88; Göttingen, 1965), pp. 138 ff.

3. The archonic angels of AJ, which, in turn, are actually planetary spirits. See above, p. 145, n. 2.

4. ZRGG 9, p. 9. Cf. AJ, C II 63.1 ff.

5. GR 101, ZRGG 9, p. 10. Cf. the Sethian-Ophite system, Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.30.3, where Adam is created according to the image of Ialdabaoth and the archons; see above, p. 167.

6. Cf. AJ, BG 50.15 ff.

with the cooperation of the Uthras, Hibil, Sitil, and Anōs.¹

Während Ptahil Adam anfasste, richtete ich seine Knochen auf. Während er die Hände auf ihn legte, liess ich ihn den Duft des gewaltigen (Lebens) riechen. Der Körper wurde voll Mark, und der Glanz des Lebens sprach in ihm²

This is myth based on an ancient gnostic exegesis of Genesis 1.26 f. and 2.7, much as it occurs in the Apocryphon of John, Saturninus, and the Sethian-Ophite text referred to above. The figure of Wisdom is missing in the Mandaean text,³ as it is also in Saturninus.

This myth occurs with variations in other Mandaean texts as well. For example, in GR, Book 10,⁴ Ptahil creates Adam according to his own image, and Eve according to the image of Adam. Ptahil casts his own spirit (ruha) into Adam, and the Planets also add of their own substance.

1. ZRGG 9, p. 10. Cf. AJ, BG 51.1 ff. and the role of the Mother and the Autogenes (= Christ), and the four lights.

2. ZRGG 9, p. 11. "Ich" = Manda-d-Haiye.

3. It is probable that the demonic Ruḥa-d-Qudsa is actually a demonized "Sophia" of Judaism; so H. Ringgren, Word and Wisdom (Lund, 1947), p. 137; cf. also Rudolph, ZRGG 9, p. 13, n. 73, and literature cited.

4. Pp. 241 ff., Petermann; pp. 242 ff., Lidzbarski; cf. Rudolph, Theogonie, p. 252.

But Ptahil and the Planets cannot raise up the lifeless body. Ptahil goes to his father Abatur, takes a hidden mana from the House of Life, and casts it into Adam and Eve.¹

The tradition that Adam's body could only writhe before it received the inbreathing from above is also found in Mandaean literature. In one of the hymns of the Ginza, the "Mana of the great life" laments,

Who hath made me dwell on earth, who hath cast me into the physical body ('ṣtun pagria) which hath no hands or feet and knoweth not how it will walk? It lies there and crawls.²

When these Mandaean creation-myths are understood for what they are, namely, remnants of older gnostic exegetical traditions on Genesis, then it can be understood also why it is that in Mandaean anthropology the spirit (ruḥa) is the lower soul, the power of the natural life, the seat of natural desire and lust, whereas the soul (mānā = nišimtā) is the higher, immortal element which derives from above. Mānā is an Iranian word for soul, a synonym of the Semitic nišimtā which of course is also

1. Cf. Rudolph, Theogonie, pp. 252 ff., for other variations; see also E. Drower, The Secret Adam (Oxford, 1960), p. 35.

2. Quoted from Drower, Secret Adam, p. 48.

frequent in the Mandaean literature.¹ In my opinion the latter is the more original term in the Mandaean anthropological vocabulary. On first glance it would appear that this is a terminological reversal of the roles of πνεῦμα and ψυχή in other gnostic systems.² The reason for this is clear: In Greek-speaking Gnosticism πνεῦμα = the πνοή of Genesis 2.7; but in Mandaean Gnosticism, nišimtā is the exact equivalent of the 𐌒𐌗𐌐𐌕 of Genesis 2.7 in the Hebrew text.³ It seems strange that the vital role played by the text of Genesis 2.7 (whether in Hebrew or in Greek) in these speculations has been so completely overlooked by many scholars.⁴

1. Cf. Drower, Secret Adam, p. 47; and Rudolph, Die Mandäer (Göttingen, 1960), I, 165 f. Indeed Ruha is personified as a demonic figure, mother of the planets, and enemy of the nišimtā in man (Drower, loc. cit.). The ultimate connection with Sophia-Prounikos-Holy Spirit is very clear. See above, p. 172, n.3.

2. The same is true in Manichaeism, according to K. Rudolph; Die Mandäer, I, 166, n. 3.

3. Rudolph refers to Scholem's statement that in some heretical Jewish systems the 𐌒𐌗𐌐𐌕 of man was considered a vital potency of the earth (based on Gen. 1.24), whereas the 𐌒𐌗𐌐𐌕 is the gift of God himself (Gen. 2.7!); cf. Scholem, Eranos Jb 22, pp. 241 ff.; and Rudolph, ZRGG 9, p. 16.

4. See above, p. 141.

Manichaeae Literature

Remnants of speculations on Genesis 1.26 f. and 2.7 are also found in Manichaeae texts. They resemble those described above, though they are heavily overlaid with specifically Manichaeae mythologoumena. I adduce here a passage from Theodore bar Koni, reputedly exposing a writing of Mani himself:¹

. . . and Asaklūn,² der Sohn des Königs der Finsternis, sagte zu den Fehlwürfen, 'Bringt her zu mir eure Söhne und eure Töchter, und ich, ja ich mache euch eine Form wie die, die ihr erblickt habt!'³ Und sie brachten sie und gaben sie ihm. Die männlichen frass er und die weiblichen gab er der Nebrōēl,⁴ seiner Paargenossin.

1. This passage comes at the end of a long and involved cosmogony. On the whole cosmogony, see H. Jonas, Gnosis I, 284 ff., and The Gnostic Religion (Boston, 1963), pp. 206 ff.; the latter is in many respects an improvement over his earlier discussion. Cf. also H.-M. Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, pp. 108 ff., and lit. cited. I quote from the German translation of the Syriac text of Liber Scholiorum XI (CSCO 66) by Alfred Adam, Texte zum Manichäismus, pp. 21 f.

2. Adam suggests in a note (p. 21, n. 65) that the name resembles the place-name Askelon, but perhaps may be related to the Mandaean astaklūn, "puer phosphorus." Far more likely is this: Saklas, the demiurge of many gnostic systems; e.g. AJ, C II, 59.17.

3. I.e., the image of the divine Messenger.

4. A. Adam refers to variant readings (p. 22, n. 66): Nakbāēl, akbāēl, Namrāēl. I have no solution for this figure.

Und Nebrōöl und Asaklūn paarten sich miteinander.
Und sie wurde schwanger von ihm--und gebar einen
Sohn, und sie nannte seinen Namen Adam. Und sie
wurde (wiederum) schwanger und gebar eine Tochter
und nannte ihren Namen Hawwa.

The ultimate dependence of this passage upon
Genesis 1.26 f. is clear.¹ The account of the giving to
Adam of his soul is omitted in bar Koni's account, but
has been preserved in one of the Turfan fragments, whose
cosmogony is parallel to that of bar Koni.² I quote only
the relevant passage:

. . . und sie gestaltete einen Körper männlicher
Gestalt mit (aus) Knochen, Nerven (oder Fett),
Fleish, Adern und Haut. Und (ein Teil) von jener
Lichtheit der Götter, die durch Früchte und Knospen
mit jenen Kindern der Mazan³ vermischt war, wurde
in seinen Körper als Seele gefesselt

There is in the distant background an exegesis of
Genesis 2.7. The soul (πνοή - ,7777) of man belongs to
the light-substance which the King of Darkness had captured,
and must eventually be redeemed.

1. So also H.-M. Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, pp. 108 f.;
and H. Jonas in Gnostic Religion, p. 227 (but not in Gnosis).

2. Turfan Fragment TIII 260. The translation is that
of Andreas and Henning, Mitteliranische Manichaica aus
Chinesisch-Turkestan I, Sitz. Heid. Ak. Wiss, philhist.
Kl. (1932), pp. 175-222; I quote from H.-M. Schenke, Der
Gott Mensch, p. 111.

3. (= "Dämonart") according to Schenke's note 16,
p. 111.

Valentinus, Fragment No. 1¹

And there came upon the angels a fear, as it were, of that creature (ἐπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ πλάσματος) when he made utterances greater than was suited to his formation (πλάσεως) on account of the One who had invisibly put into him the seed of the substance from above (σπέρμα . . . τῆς ἄνωθεν οὐσίας), the One who speaks freely (παρρησιαζόμενον). So also among the generations of earthly men, the works of men become fears to those who make them as, for example, statues and images and all things which the hands fashion in the name of a god. For Adam, formed (πλασθεὶς) in the name of Man, produced fear of the pre-existing Man, as though he were existing in him, and the angels were terrified and quickly removed their work.

This passage is best understood against the background of the passages from the Apocryphon of John and Saturninus treated above. Adam, formed (πλάσμα, πλάσις, πλασθεὶς ἐπλάσεν, Gen. 2.7a) by the angels as an image (εἰκὼν) of, and in the name of, the divine Anthropos (Gen. 1.26 f.) had secretly been given a substance from above (Gen. 2.7b) which enabled him to rise above his plasmatic creation and to despise the angels of creation.²

1. Preserved in Clem. Alex. Strom. 2.36.2-4; cf. W. Völker, Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis (Tübingen, 1932), pp. 57 ff.

2. Cf. Evangelium Veritatis (EV) 17.28 f.: καταφρονί
ᾧ τῆς πλάσσης πλάνη refers to the Demiurge and the powers of creation; see below, p. 192 n.1.

As a result of this the angels are terrified and cast their creative work down into the lowest depths of materiality.¹ Nothing is said specifically of the mediation of Sophia; in this respect the fragment resembles Saturninus' system.²

The Gospel of Truth

The motif of the raising up of lifeless Adam is treated homiletically in the Valentinian Gospel of Truth (= EV) 30.16-26:

And the Spirit ($\pi\iota\pi\tau\alpha$)³ ran to him in haste to raise him up. Giving its hand to the one lying on the ground, it stood him upright on his feet, for he had not yet stood up. It gave them the possibility of knowing the knowledge of the Father and the revelation of his Son.

1. For parallels in AJ, see especially BG 48.11-49.9; 51.4-52.17. On the motif of secrecy, see the Gospel of Philip 16 on the operation of the Holy Spirit (Wisdom) over against the archons. See also on the motif of the worship by men of their own creations the Gospel of Philip 85. And on the treachery of the archons, see the Gospel of Philip 13.

2. On the term σπέρμα in connection with the πνοή-πνεῦμα of Gen. 2.7, see below, p.222 .

3. Wisdom? Cf. the Gospel of Philip 16 on the secrecy of the Holy Spirit, a role assumed by Wisdom elsewhere, e.g. in the Sethian-Ophite passage treated above.

The mythological substratum shows through clearly, although the theme is treated from a very different perspective, proper to the genre of EV as an esoteric homily.¹ Its purpose is to edify the Valentinian congregation by a celebration of the blessings of gnosis which is accessible to those who have the "spirit."²

The Apocalypse of Adam

In the Apocalypse of Adam from Codex V of the Chenoboskion library,³ there occurs the following passage (66.14-25):

And the Lord (ΠΑΘΕΙC), the God who had created us,⁴ came up to us and said to us, "Adam, why do

1. By far the best short treatment of EV as a whole, its genre and its character as a Valentinian document, is that of Hans Jonas, "Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation," Studia Patristica (TU 81; Berlin, 1962), VI, 96-111.

2. For other Valentinian texts and discussion thereof, see below, pp. 212 ff.

3. A. Böhlig (ed.), Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg; Halle, 1963).

4. Cf. 64.16: "For we were higher than the God who had created us and the powers that were with him"

you groan in your hearts? Don't you know that I am the God who created you? And I have breathed into you a spirit of life (ΔΙΝΙΥΕ ΕΡΩΤΝ ΕΡΩΤΝ ΝΟΤΤΝΔ ΝΤΕ ΠΩΝΕ) so that you might become a living soul (ΕΡΡΑΙ ΕΥΨΥΧΗ ΕΚΟΝΕ)." Then a darkness came over our eyes. Then the God who had [cre]ated us made a

The text breaks off at this point. When it resumes in pl. 67, Adam is saying that he recognized a sweet desire for (Seth's) mother. But--

then was lost to us the vigor (ΤΑΚΜΗ) of our eternal knowledge (67.4-8).

The use of Genesis 2.7 seems at first glance quite peculiar for a gnostic document. The πνεῦμα is described as the product of the creator-god himself and nothing is said of a higher power working independently of, or secretly through, the creator. But this first impression is corrected in 76.17 ff., in the context of the apocalypse proper:¹

For the whole formation (ΠΙΠΛΑΕΜΔ ΤΗΡΥ) which originated from the dead earth (ΕΤΑΥΩΩΠΕ

At 74.3,7 he is given the name Saclas; at 69.5; 72.25; and 73.9 he is referred to as παντοκράτωρ.

1. The actual apocalypse is attributed to three men who appeared to Adam in a dream (65.25 ff.; 67.15-21); it begins at 67.22 and continues to 85.18. The larger framework is, in genre, a "testament," addressed by Adam to his son Seth.

ἐβόλ ῥῆ πικὰρ ἐτῆοιτ) will come under the power of death. But those who think in their hearts the gnosis of the eternal God will not perish. For they have not received the spirit (πνῆ) from this same kingdom, but they have received it from one of the eternal angels . . .¹

Thus (gnostic) man's πνεῦμα derives not from the creator-god or his kingdom, but from a realm higher than that of Saclas, the Creator. The reference to "one of the eternal angels" and the occurrence of the word φωστήρ in the following line suggest that behind the Apocalypse of Adam there is a myth akin to that of the Apocryphon of John.² This latter passage is a corrective to what, after all, was Saclas' own claim in the passage quoted first.

However, the Gnostics of the Apocalypse of Adam are not referred to as πνευματικοί, but rather as the "kingless generation" (82.19 f.) and the progeny of Seth (65.5-9; 85.20-22).³

1. At this point, line 27, the text breaks off. All that is left of line 28 is: . . .] φωστήρ . . .

2. Cf. the role of the "angels" and the φωστῆρες in the giving of the πνεῦμα to man in AJ; see above, p. 149.

3. For "kingless generation" see further below, p. 212, n.1. . The figure of Seth occupies a very large place in gnostic speculation; on this see in general, and in Mandaean texts in particular, K. Rudolph, Theogonie, p. 304, n. 4. A look at the index under "Seth" in J. Doresse, Secret Books, is also very instructive. In the Bruce Codex 26

The Naassene Commentary

From the Naassene commentary on a hymn to Attis preserved by Hippolytus,¹ the following passage is of particular import (Ref. 5.7.6 f.):

The Assyrians say that fish-eating Oannes was born among them (as the first man); the Chaldaeans say Adam, and this was the only man whom Earth brought forth.² But he lay without breath (ἀπνουν) motionless, immovable, like a statue, being an image of that Man above, the celebrated Adamas, having been made by many powers, concerning whom there is much to be said separately. In order, therefore, that the great Man from above might be completely overpowered . . . there was given to him a soul also (ἐδόθη αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχῇ)

C. Baynes (ed.) (Cambridge, 1933), *CHΘΕΥC* is referred to as God (εὐο *ΝΝΟΥΤΕ* *Παι* *Πε*)!

1. The text of the hymn itself occurs in 5.9.8 of Hippolytus' Refutatio. The hymn has been assigned by Wilamowitz to the time of the emperor Hadrian; see Nilsson, Geschichte II, 606. The Naassene-gnostic commentary on the non-gnostic hymn to Attis underlies the material in Ref. 5.7.3-5.9.6. For an important attempt to reconstruct the Naassene system see R. Reitzenstein's contribution in Reitzenstein and H. Schaeder, Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 7; Leipzig, 1926); and for an equally important critique of the same see A. D. Nock's review in JHS 49 (1929), 111-116.

2. Cf. the opening lines of the commentary: Ἦ δέ, φασὶν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἄνθρωπον ἀνέδωκε πρώτη καλὸν ἐνεγκαμένη γέρας The reference to "Chaldaeans" cannot be taken to indicate a Mesopotamian origin for the theologoumena herein, as opposed to a Jewish origin; see Quispel, Eranos Jb 22, p. 204, n. 17; Rudolph, ZRGG 9, pp. 8 f.; Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, pp. 57-59.

in order that the creature (πλάσμα) of the great and glorious and perfect Man might suffer and be punished in bonds through the soul (διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς).

Several motifs are familiar: the creation of Adam's body by many powers¹ as an image of the Man above, but lifeless and immovable so long as it is without the divine inbreathing (ἄπνους). Speculations on Genesis 1.26 f. and 2.7 similar to those of Saturninus, the Apocryphon of John, etc., are evident, though there are differences in points of detail. This is confirmed in other parts of the commentary: the spirit-less Adam is πλάσμα τὸ πῆλινον (7.30), πλάσμα τῆς λήθης, τὸ χοῖκον (7.36; cf. 8.14). The latter designations reflect the words ἔπλασε and χούν from the text of Genesis 2.7.

The term ψυχῆ also reflects a particular understanding of Genesis 2.7, though the manner in which this term is introduced presents difficulties in understanding the passage as a whole. Reitzenstein suggested that Hippolytus was confused here and stated the Naassene position incorrectly. In Reitzenstein's view, the ψυχῆ is actually to be understood as the heavenly Man who is

1. Chief of whom is Esaldaios, a "god of fire" (7.30). Is there a play in this name on the Hebrew word for "fire" (ψχ)?

bound to the earthly Adam and thus enslaved.¹ This interpretation would presuppose a dichotomy in the passage of body and soul.² But since a trichotomous anthropology is explicitly attributed to the Naassenes elsewhere, it seems best to assume that the passage is incomplete,³ in that it omits any specific mention of the heavenly πνεῦμα or νοῦς. The relation of the πλάσμα to the heavenly Man is simply expressed through the word εἰκὼν (7.6). The ψυχή, therefore, is one of three aspects of man and is evaluated negatively.

This is consistent with what Hippolytus says elsewhere (Ref. 5.6.6):

They [the Naassenes] divide him [i.e. Man] as Geryon⁴ into three parts. There are, of this Man, the intelligent (τὸ νοερόν), the psychic (τὸ ψυχικόν), and the earthy (τὸ χοϊκόν), and they think that the knowledge of him is the beginning of the ability to know God⁵

1. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 84.

2. So Rudolph, ZRGG 9, pp. 8, 14.

3. So Brandenburger, Adam und Christus, p. 84, who attempts to gain a more complete picture of the Naassene myth with references from Zosimos. Brandenburger correctly posits a negative evaluation of the ψυχή; see p. 85, n. 2.

4. Cf. Γηρυόνην . . . τρισώματον, 8.4.

5. The passage immediately following explains how all three came together into one man, Jesus.

In spite of the unfortunate state of the text one can still discern a doctrine of three principles: νοῦς (= νοερός); χάος (= χοϊκός, cf. χυθέν) and ψυχή (= ψυχικός). The soul is representative of man in his unredeemed state, caught and enmired in the world of chaotic materiality. Potentially salvable it languishes in the sphere of death and evil until it is redeemed by gnosis. In the "Hymn of the Soul" the Redeemer is Jesus. Surveying the plight of the soul Jesus says,

"Look, Father, a prey of evils upon the earth she wanders, away from your breath (ἀπὸ σῆς πνοῆς) she seeks to flee the bitter chaos, and knows not how to traverse it. Therefore send me, Father; I will descend . . . and deliver, under the name of gnosis, the hidden mysteries of the sacred way" (10.2).

The term ψυχικός occurs for the first time in the Naassene commentary (at 8.26) in a quotation from 1 Corinthians 2.14; the term is used to describe those without the experience of salvation (gnosis, "rebirth," etc.). Thus the term is compatible with the understanding of the word ψυχή which we have encountered in the system as a whole, and confirms the interpretation advanced for ψυχή above (7.7). The term ψυχικός occurs again (8.34) in reference to the non-gnostic, unredeemed Phrygians who

do not understand the true meaning of their own hymn to Attis!¹

The term πνευματικός occurs for the first time in the Naassene commentary (at 7.40) in the context of an appropriation of John 3.5 f. and a discussion of "birth from above." The term is used consistently throughout the rest of the commentary² to refer to those who have been redeemed, who have experienced ἀναγέννησις, and the Gospel of John is frequently quoted in these contexts. According to the Naassene system one becomes πνευματικός by the reception of gnosis. The Naassene teaching does not provide for a class of men who are πνευματικοί and "saved by nature" as is the case with the Valentinians.³

In summary: a traditional exegesis of Genesis 2.7 (and 1.26 f.) occurs at the beginning of the Naassene

1. See also 8.44 f. on the Eleusinian Mysteries.

2. The Gospel of John is quoted in connection with the doctrine of ἀναγέννησις; see e.g. 8.10-12; 8.18-21; 8.36-38. Synonyms for ἀναγέννησις are ἀνοδος (8.18, quoting from Ps. 23.7-10 LXX) and ἀνάστασις (8.24-28, quoting from 2 Cor. 12.2-4 and 1 Cor. 2.13 f.).

3. The Naassene teaching thus resembles that of the Simonians. Note that at Ref. 5.9.5 the Megale Apophasis of Simon is quoted. On the Valentinian doctrine, see below, pp. 223 ff.

commentary preserved by Hippolytus. Though nothing is said there explicitly of man's πνεῦμα, the ψυχή is treated negatively, and throughout the system the ψυχή is symbolic of man's helplessness apart from heavenly redemption. The term ψυχικός--which actually occurs first in a quotation from Paul--denotes man in his helpless condition, only potentially salvable. The term χοϊκός is used characteristically to denote the earthly and bodily nature of man. The term πνευματικός is used to denote redeemed man, man as having achieved "rebirth"; its usage is conditioned by the use and interpretation of the Gospel of John as well as selected quotations from Paul.

Justin, Baruch

In a gnostic system described by Hippolytus¹ and ostensibly derived from a book entitled Baruch by a gnostic called "Justin,"² there occurs the following exegesis of

1. Ref. 5.23-28. Hippolytus is our only source for the system.

2. Ref. 5.23.1; 24.2. Hans Jonas refers to a theory of Schultz that the name "Justin" was a mis-application of the name of Justin Martyr to the author of a system described in Justin's lost Syntagma; see Gnosis I, 335, n. 2. Against this see Haenchen, ZTK 50, p. 123.

Genesis 2.7 (Ref. 5.26.7 f.):

When Paradise had come into being¹ from the mutual satisfaction of Elohim and Eden, the angels of Elohim took of the most beautiful earth--i.e. not from the beastly (θηριωδῶν) portions of Eden but from the upper (lit. "above the groin," ὑπὲρ βουβῶνα) anthropoid and cultivated regions of earth--and made man.² From the beastly portions the wild beasts and other living creatures derived their origin. Man, therefore, they made as a symbol of their unity and love, and deposited in him their own powers, Eden the soul and Elohim the spirit ('Εδέμ μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν, 'Ελωεὶμ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα). Thus man, Adam, became as it were a seal and memorial of their love and an eternal symbol of the marriage of Eden and Elohim.

In the passage following Eve is created similarly, and both Adam and Eve are given a command to "increase and multiply" (Gen. 1.28)., In the passage just quoted the most important of several traditional Jewish interpretations are the creation of Adam's body by the angels (though here without explicit reference to Genesis 1.26 f.) and the Hellenistic-Jewish distinction between man's πνεῦμα and his ψυχή.

In the system as a whole three first-principles are posited: the Good, the Father Elohim, and the female

1. Omit φησι' here and elsewhere.

2. Cf. here Philo's speculations on the materials God used to form man's body, Op. 136-138.

Eden.¹ The sexually-oriented nature of the system can be seen among other things in the identification of the Good with Priapus (26.32 f.)! Elohim is the second male principle, the father of all things begotten (26.1); and Eden is the female principle, a personification of Earth (cf. γῆ γὰρ οὖσα, 26.14). Scholem is probably correct in seeing in the name "Eden" ('Εδέμ as in the LXX) a fusion with Hebrew 'adamah.² Creation is a result of the sexual union between Elohim and Eden. Man derives his πνεῦμα from Elohim and his ψυχὴ from Eden. This means that the psychic nature is earthly, derived from earth, and is thus virtually identical with the χοϊκός part of man (χοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς Gen. 2.7).

The presence of evil in the world is a result of the "repentance" of Elohim. When he ascended to the highest part of heaven to view his creation he discovered that there existed something higher than himself (i.e. the Good), and that he was really not the Lord (26.15).³ So

1. On the system as a whole see especially E. Haenchen, "Das Buch Baruch," ZTK 50 (1953), 123-158; R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp. 191 ff., and now After the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 197-207.

2. Eranos Jb 22, p. 242.

3. Elohim says, ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας, ἵνα εἰσελθῶν

he ascended through the gates, leaving Eden behind¹ frustrated, and was seated at the right hand of the Good, having seen "what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor has entered the heart of man" (26.16).² Meanwhile Eden, in her rage, torments the spirit of Elohim in man through her angel Naas (26.19-21). As a result,

the soul is set against the spirit, and the spirit against the soul (ἡ ψυχὴ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τέτακται καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, 26.25).³

ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ (cf. Ps. 118.19 = LXX 117.19): ἐδοκουν γὰρ ἐγὼ κύριος εἶναι. Here we encounter the familiar notion of the ignorance of the Demiurge, and his claim to be the only God; see Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, pp. 87 ff. Elohim is a repentant figure, somewhat akin to Sabaoth in the Untitled Text from Cod. II (see 151.32-155.17 and also Hypostasis of the Archons 143.13-144.3).

1. Cf. on this motif CH 1.10: the Logos forsakes Physis. And on the eroticism of Physis, see CH 1.14. Cf. also the Valentinian system, wherein Christ forsakes Achamoth (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.4.1).

2. On this quotation, see Chapter IV, p.p. 94 ff.

3. Haenchen, ZTK 50, p. 139, sees here a reflection of Gal. 5.17: ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός. The verbal similarity does not seem to me to be enough to argue for a use of Paul here. In fact none of the passages Haenchen adduces to show influence from Pauline literature (pp. 139 f.) are convincing. Of course, other N. T. writings are certainly used without a doubt; on this see Haenchen, pp. 139-141. It is probable that Paul's writings were known to the gnostic author, but that he quoted from them has not been demonstrated.

Elohim counters by sending his own angel Baruch "to help the spirit which is in all men" (26.21). Baruch works through Moses, the prophets, and Heracles, but all of them are seduced by Naas, the angel of Eden--until finally Baruch is sent to Jesus who alone remains faithful to Baruch.

Therefore Naas became angry, because he was unable to seduce him, and he caused him to be crucified.¹ He, leaving the body of Eden on the cross, ascended to the Good, saying to Eden, "Woman, you have your son" (Jn. 19.26), i.e. the psychic and earthly man (τοῦτέστι τὸν ψυχικὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸν χοϊκόν). Entrusting his spirit to the hands of his father (cf. Lk. 23.46), he ascended to the Good.

The ψυχικός and χοϊκός nature of man (Jesus, in this passage) are so closely related as to be identical, both deriving from the Earth-figure "Eden." The πνεῦμα, belonging to Elohim, is that which is saved and ultimately ascends to the Good. It is to be noted that Elohim (not Jesus) is the real prototype of salvation in the system of "Justin."²

1. Cf. the similar motif in EV 17, where Πλάνη crucifies Jesus; but there the serpent-role is reversed. See my article, "Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?" JBL 86 (1967), 304.

2. Jesus is a redeemer figure only in a secondary sense. The whole system could stand very well by itself with all of the Christian references removed, though that

The πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology occurs in one other passage from "Justin" in the context of a description of salvation. The adherents of Justin's congregation are required to swear an oath of secrecy (5.27.2-3):¹

And this is the oath: "I swear by the one above all things, the Good, to keep these mysteries and to babble them to no one, and not to return from the Good to the creation (μηδὲ ἀνακάμψαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν κτίσιν)." When he swears this oath, he enters into the Good and sees "what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, and what has not entered the heart of man," and he drinks of the living water, which is a washing for them (as they think), a bubbling spring of living water (Jn. 4.10,14). For there was a division made between earth and water (cf. Gen. 1.6), and the water below the firmament pertains to the evil creation in which are washed the earthly and psychic men (ἐν ᾧ λούονται οἱ χοϊκοὶ καὶ ψυχικοὶ ἄνθρωποι), but the living water above the firmament pertains to the Good, in which are washed the pneumatic and living men (ἐν ᾧ λούονται οἱ πνευματικοὶ καὶ ζῶντες ἄνθρωποι), in which Elohim washed, and having washed did not change his mind (λουσάμενος οὐ μετεμελήθη).²

is not to say that the N. T. citations and Christian references are interpolations into the text.

1. Cf. 24.1: "For our Father, seeing the Good and having been made perfect with him, guarded the ineffable things of silence, and swore, as it is written, 'the Lord swore and will not change his mind' (Ps. 110.4 = LXX 109.4)."

2. See preceding note, and quotation from Ps. 109.4 (LXX).

The πνευματικοί and ζῶντες (the terms are used synonymously) are those who have participated in the salvation of Elohim, who have been washed in the "living water" in which Elohim was washed.¹ The χοῖκοί and ψυχικοί (again, one can posit a synonymous use) are those not participating in salvation, who belong to the "evil creation" below, the sphere of Eden.²

In summary, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός-(χοῖκός) terminology in Justin, Baruch, arises out of an exegesis of Genesis 2.7, in which the πνεῦμα contributed by Elohim is sharply distinguished from the earthly ψυχή contributed by Eden (= Earth). The use of this terminology in "Justin" is, in many respects, distinct from that of other gnostic systems, and the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is handled in a unique manner. The importance of Genesis 2.7 as a focal text for anthropological and theological speculation and the close relation of the technical use

1. There seems to be reflected some sort of gnostic baptism in which the baptismal water is also drunk. The same practice is attested for the Sethians according to Hippolytus, Ref. 5.19.21 and for the Mandaeans. On the latter see E. Segelberg, Maṣbūtā (Uppsala, 1958), pp. 59 ff.

2. 26.14,18 f. Is their "washing" to be understood as a reference to Christian baptism as practiced in the catholic Church?

of ψυχικός to the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is thereby impressively underscored.

The Sophia Jesu Christi

The document entitled Sophia Jesu Christi was first published by W. Till in his edition of the Codex Bero-
linensis 8502, of which it forms a part.¹ Another version has turned up amongst the Chenoboskion texts similar to that of BG. In addition a Greek fragment is known.² The essential contents of the Sophia Jesu Christi are represented in the Epistle of Eugnostos, of which there are two copies in the Chenoboskion library.³ Indeed, the Sophia Jesu Christi is essentially the Epistle of Eugnostos cast in the form of a dialogue between Jesus and his disciples.⁴

1. TU 60.5. SJC follows immediately upon the AJ, beginning with p. 77 of the codex.

2. P.Ox. 1081; cf. H.-C. Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, trans. Wilson (Philadelphia, 1965), I, 244.

3. Cf. Doresse, Secret Books, p. 192.

4. The parallel material in Eugnostos extends from BG 80.5 to 117.12, thus not including the passage we are about to quote. Cf. Till's ed. of BG, p. 52.

Sophia Jesu Christi is thus secondary to the Epistle of Eugnostos.¹ The text of Sophia Jesu Christi from Chenoboskion has not as yet been published and the pages with our text are missing anyway;² thus we are limited to the text in BG.

In Sophia Jesu Christi the term ψυχικός occurs only once (the adjectives πνευματικός and χοϊκός do not occur) in a passage which also involves an exegesis of Genesis 2.7. The passage reads (119.2-121.17):

Out of the Aeon, above the emanation of light which I have mentioned earlier,³ there came a drop (τῷ + λῆ) from the Light and the Spirit down to the parts below, (to the region) of the Almighty of Chaos (παντοκράτωρ ἀπεχός), in order that it might reveal their⁴ formation (ἡνεγπλασμά). From this drop was condemned (ἐρτάδο νδγ) the Archigenetor, who is usually called Ialdabaoth. This drop revealed their formation (ἡνεγπλασμά) by means of the breath (qitā pnyē) as a living

1. So Doresse, p. 198; cf. also M. Krause, "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi," Mullus (Festschrift Th. Klausner; Münster, 1964), pp. 215-223.

2. The two missing pages from the Chenoboskion version contain precisely the passage which we are quoting! Cf. Till's table, p. 54.

3. Cf. 90.4 ff.

4. I.e., the archons', referred to in this passage as "robbers"; cf. also 94.18 and 104.12. Cf. also at 125.16 f.: "the Archigenetor . . . and his angels."

soul (ⲉⲣⲱⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲥⲥⲓⲛⲟ , Gen. 2.7b). It withered and slumbered because of the oblivion of the soul (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲓⲛ ⲧⲃⲱⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲱⲩⲭⲏ). As it became warm from the breath of the great Light (ⲡⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲟⲣⲟⲥⲓⲛ) of the Male, then he (i.e. Ialdabaoth) conceived a thought that all those in the world of chaos and everything in it should be named by that Immortal One (cf. Gen. 2.19 f.), since the breath had been breathed into him.

These things, when they happened, (happened) by that will of Sophia (ⲙⲉⲛ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲁⲙⲁⲣ ⲛⲧⲥⲟⲩⲁ), in order that the Immortal Man (ⲡⲓⲁⲧⲙⲟⲣ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ) might regulate (ⲉⲩⲉⲣⲟⲣⲙⲁⲩⲉ) the garment¹ which was there, since the robbers were condemned. And they greeted the breath (ⲧⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩ) from this breath (ⲡⲛⲓⲩⲉ).² Since he (Adam) was psychic (ⲉⲣⲱⲩⲭⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲁⲉ ⲡⲉ) he was not able to receive for himself this power until the number of chaos (ⲡⲁⲣⲓⲑⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲧⲡⲭⲁⲟⲥ) is fulfilled, when its own time has been fulfilled through the great angel. But I have explained to you the Immortal Man, and I have broken the fetters of the robbers from him.

Also compare the statement of the Redeemer in

122.5-123.1:

For this reason I have come to this place, that they might be united with this Spirit and with the breath (ⲙⲛ ⲡⲓⲡⲛⲁ ⲉⲧⲁⲙⲁⲣ ⲙⲛ ⲡⲛⲓⲩⲉ) and both become a unity as from the beginning,

1. I.e. the soul. Cf. Gospel of Maria, BG 15.8, where the ψυχή is explicitly referred to as a ⲩⲃⲥⲱ.

2. This sentence indicates that the text of SJC has undergone some development in its transmission as a Coptic document, though the original language was probably Greek. For the word ⲛⲓⲩⲉ, is the exact equivalent of Greek πνοή; the sentence καὶ ἡσπάζοντο τὴν πνοὴν ἐκ τῆς πνοῆς ἐκείνης would not make sense in Greek. Some Coptic scribe seems to have created a small distinction here between ⲛⲓⲩⲉ and πνοή.

that you might bear rich fruit and ascend to the One who was from the beginning, to the unspeakable joy, glory, honor, and grace of the Father of the All.

The first passage quoted is a very difficult one both to translate and to interpret, partly because there is in Sophia Jesu Christi no systematic myth or schema. It reflects a myth, but does not present it systematically.¹ Nevertheless those portions of the text which are of special interest to us are clear enough: the term $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ is based on a particular understanding of the word $\psi\chi\eta'$ in Genesis 2.7. The $\psi\chi\eta'$ is the creative product of the "robber" angels, and that which causes the "drop" from above in the inbreathing (Gen. 2.7b) to slumber and to diminish. The $\pi\nu\omicron\eta'$ ($\nu\iota\upsilon\epsilon$) is distinguished from the $\psi\chi\eta'$, and in 122.8 ff. is brought into conjunction with the term $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$. The awakening of the immortal element in man is connected with the coming and revelation of the Redeemer (Jesus Christ, 77.8 et passim). The work of the Redeemer is similarly described in 104.8-17:

But I have come from the place above, according to the will of the great Light. I liberated the creation; I broke the handiwork of the robber-grave.

1. Cf. Till's remarks on the difficulties in SJC for this reason, p. 56.

I awakened him, i.e. that drop ($\tau\lambda\tau\lambda\epsilon$) which was sent from the Sophia, so that he might through me bear rich fruit

What is reflected in all of these passages is a system similar to that of the Apocryphon of John,¹ but somewhat more Christianized in that Jesus Christ plays a more crucial role.

One item of peculiarity is the use of the word "drop" ($\tau\lambda\tau\lambda\epsilon$ = Gr. $\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$)² as a key term to describe the heavenly part of man, though here in connection with the $\pi\nu\omicron\eta$ of Genesis 2.7. The term $\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ or $\tau\lambda\tau\lambda\epsilon$ is not a common one in gnostic texts.³ Since $\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ can be understood as a synonym for $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$,⁴ one can perhaps conjecture

1. On the relation between the systems of AJ and SJC, and the reconstruction of the system underlying both, see now H.-M. Schenke, "Die Spitze des dem Apokryphen Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems," ZRGG 14 (1962), 352-361.

2. Cf. Crum, 411b; also $\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$.

3. I have found it outside of SJC only in the Apocalypse of Adam. In ApAd 79.19 we are told that the fifth kingdom (of thirteen, plus the "kingless generation," 77.27-83.4) "originated from a seed of heaven" ($\tau\lambda\tau\lambda\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon$ $\pi\pi\epsilon$). In 80.11,17 the seventh kingdom is called "a drop" ($\sigma\tau\lambda\tau\lambda\epsilon$); cf. 81.20, in connection with the tenth kingdom.

4. See LSJ, p. 1565.

that $\gamma\lambda\iota\lambda\epsilon$ carries a meaning and provenance similar to that of $\sigma\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$ in other gnostic texts.¹

One further observation: In Sophia Jesu Christi the gnostics are not referred to as $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\iota$, but as a "kingless generation," a designation that appears in a number of gnostic texts and systems.²

The Hypostasis of the Archons

The document entitled Hypostasis of the Archons³

1. On $\sigma\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$ in the Valentinian material, see below, p. 222. Incidentally, such a usage of the term "drop" is exactly opposite that which occurs in rabbinic anthropological speculation. In Pirke Aboth 3.1, 'Akabia ben Mahalalel (first generation Tanna) is quoted as saying: "Keep in view three things and thou wilt not come into the power of sin. Know whence thou comest and whither thou goest and before whom thou art to give strict account. Whence thou comest,--from a fetid drop ($\gamma\lambda\iota\lambda\epsilon$ $\gamma\lambda\iota\lambda\epsilon$). Whither thou goest,--to the place of dust, worms and maggots: and before whom thou art to give strict account,--Before the king of the kings of kings, the Holy one blessed be He" (ed. and trans. by R. Travers Herford). On this see R. Meyer, Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie (Stuttgart, 1937), pp. 33-39.

2. See below, p. 212, n.1.

3. This title is derived from the colophon at the end, Pl. 145: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\tilde{\nu}$. The document begins, however, $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon$ $\theta\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\zeta}\omicron\kappa\iota\delta$.

from Codex II of the Chenoboskion library represents a gnostic system somewhat akin to that of the Apocryphon of John. It opens with a reference to "the great apostle Paul" and a quotation from Ephesians 6.12! The intent of the document is to describe the nature and function of these πνευματικά τῆς πονηρίας, referred to in the treatise itself variously as ἐξουσία and ἄρχοντες.¹ Their chief, Samael, is blind and foolish because he thought that he was the only God (134.27-135.1),² a notion which is rebuked by a voice from above (135.1 ff.).³

The πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology occurs in the following passage, also containing speculations on Genesis 2.7 (135.11-136.16):⁴

1. The document seems to be some sort of epistolary treatise. See 134.26: "[Ich habe] dies verfasst, weil du nach dem Wesen der Mächte fragst."

2. Cf. Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, pp. 87 ff.

3. From Πίστις Σοφία, according to 142.5 ff.; cf. the Untitled Text 157.17-21. This pattern has already been observed in AJ and in the Sethian-Ophite system of Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.30.

4. I quote from the translation of Schenke in Leipoldt-Schenke, Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi (Hamburg, 1960), pp. 76 f. The text is available only in the plates published by P. Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo (Cairo, 1956), vol. I (no other volumes have appeared).

Die Unvergänglichkeit (ΤΥΝΤΑΤΤΕΚΟ)¹ blickte herab auf die Gebiete des Wassers. Ihr Bild offenbarte sich in dem Wasser, und die Mächte der Finsternis (ΝΕΖΟΚΙΑ ΑΠΚΑΚΕ) ver- liebten sich in sie. Sie konnten aber jenes Bild, das sich ihnen im Wasser geoffenbart hatte, wegen ihrer Schwäche nicht erreichen; denn die Seelischen können das Geistige nicht erreichen (ΔΕ ΜΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ ΝΑΤΕΡΕ ΑΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ ΔΝ)²; sie stammen nämlich von unten, dieses dagegen stammt von oben. Deswegen blickte die Unvergänglichkeit auf die Gebiete herab, damit sie nach dem Willen des Vaters das All mit dem Licht vereinige. Die Archonten (ΑΡΧΩΝ) fassten einen Beschluss und sagten: "Kommt, lasst uns einen Menschen schaffen (Gen. 1.26) aus Staub von der Erde" (ΑΝΟΡΧΟΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΓΑΠΚΑΘ, Gen. 2.7a)! Sie bildeten den Leib (ΑΓΡΠΛΑΚΕ ΑΠΤ[ω]ΜΑ), so dass es ein ganz und gar Erdgeborener war. Der Leib, den die Archonten aber haben, ist [mann-]weiblich; die Gesichter sind die von Tieren.³ Sie nahmen [Staub] von der Erde (Gen. 2.7). Sie bildeten (ΑΓΡΠΛΑΚΕ) [ihren Menschen] nach ihrem Leibe und [nach dem Bilde] Gottes, das sich [ihnen] in

The parentheses in the passage as I quote it are mine, indicating from the Coptic plates certain Coptic or Coptic-Greek words, and also Gen. passages where relevant.

1. Gr. = ἀφθαρσία. Here a reference to the highest deity is probably intended; cf. Schenke, Der Gott Mensch, p. 62.

2. Gr. = οἱ ψυχικοὶ οὐ καταλαμβάνουσι τὰ πνευματικά. Cf. in an exactly analogous context, Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.8.3, where the ignorance of the psychic Demiurge is explained on the basis of 1 Cor. 2.14. Is 1 Cor. 2.14 in the background here as well?

3. Cf. 142.14 ff.; also AJ, BG 41.18 ff., where the (planetary) rulers are described as having animal faces. On Ialdabaoth as a lion-figure, cf. Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 351 ff.

dem Wasser geoffenbart hatte. Sie sagten "[Kommt,] wir [wollen] es in unserem Gebilde ($\rho\mu\pi\bar{\nu}\pi\lambda\delta\sigma\mu\delta$) erreichen, [damit] es sein Eben-[Bild] sieht, [zu ihm kommt] und wir es in unserem Gebilde ($\rho\mu\pi\bar{\nu}\pi\lambda\delta\sigma\mu\delta$) festhalten," während sie die Kraft Gottes ($\tau\delta\gamma\nu\delta\mu\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\pi\nu\sigma\gamma\tau\epsilon$) in ihrer Kraftlosigkeit nicht erkannten. Er blies in sein Gesicht, und der Mensch war seelisch auf der Erde ($\delta\psi\nu\iota\psi\epsilon$ $\epsilon\rho\sigma\gamma\nu$ $\rho\mu$ $\pi\epsilon\psi\theta\sigma$ $\delta\tau\omega$ $\delta\pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\psi\omega\pi\epsilon$ $\mu\psi\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\delta\mu\pi\kappa\delta\epsilon$ Gen. 2.7b) viele Tage lang. Sie vermochten nun infolge ihrer Kraftlosigkeit nicht, ihn aufzurichten. Wie die Wirbelwinde beharrten sie dabei, jenem Bilde, das sich ihnen in dem Wasser geoffenbart hatte, aufzulauern. Sie wussten aber nicht, wie gross seine Kraft war. Dies alles aber geschah nach dem Willen des Vaters des Alls. Danach sah der Geist ($\pi\bar{\nu}\delta$) den seelischen ($\psi\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$) Menschen auf der Erde; und der Geist kam aus der stählernen Erde heraus. Er kam herab und liess sich in ihm nieder. Jener Mensch wurde zu einer lebendigen Seele ($\delta\pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\tau\bar{\alpha}\nu\delta\alpha\gamma$ $\psi\omega\pi\epsilon$ $\delta\tau\psi\chi\eta$ [ϵ] $\sigma\omicron\nu\epsilon$, Gen. 2.7b).

Some problems of this passage are very likely due to the fact that it presents a highly developed myth in which various items already traditional in gnostic systems are put together somewhat illogically. This is the case especially with the interpretation of Genesis 2.7b. At 136.3 f. the inbreathing of the archon (Samael) is connected with man's psychic nature, a nature which is similar to that of the archons themselves, who are "psychic."¹ The term $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ here--and throughout the passage--is

1. Cf. the same motif in AJ, discussed above, p. 148.

derived from the word $\psi\chi\eta'$ in Genesis 2.7. Nevertheless at 136.11-16 the same text, Genesis 2.7b, is connected with the reception by Adam of the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, reflecting a previous tradition wherein the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ was identified with the $\pi\nu\omicron\eta'$ of Genesis 2.7, and sharply distinguished from the $\psi\chi\eta'$.¹ The $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is almost personified,² and is to be understood as equivalent to the $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega\acute{\nu}$ of the "incorruptibility" which was reflected in the waters (cf. $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in Gen. 1.2). It performs in Hypostasis of the Archons the same function as Sophia in the Apocryphon of John. Indeed, it is clear that the $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega\acute{\nu}$ - $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is a female entity.³ This can be seen from the erotic motif that is found at 135.14, and from the fact that she is identified with the "spiritual woman" ($\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\mu\epsilon \mu\pi\nu\epsilon\kappa\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\eta$) at 137.11.⁴

1. As in, e.g., AJ.

2. Cf. the same view of the role of the spirit in EV 30.16-26 and in the Gospel of Philip 16. See above, p. 178.

3. This reflects the oldest level of speculation on the $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega\acute{\nu}$ according to G. Quispel, Eranos Jb 22, pp. 202 f.

4. On the gnostic Wisdom-figure as a pleromatic projection of Eve, see now the brilliant dissertation by George McRae, "Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge, 1966), especially I, 279 f. and 293-296. I am very grateful to

The term $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ is used again at 137.10 f. The archons have plotted together: "Come let us bring a sleep of forgetfulness ($\bar{\beta}\alpha\lambda\epsilon$) over Adam" (cf. Gen. 2.21). While Adam sleeps his sleep of forgetfulness, defined further as "ignorance" ($\tau\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\phi\bar{\nu}$, 137.6), the archons reveal his rib as a "living woman" ($\epsilon\gamma\iota\mu\epsilon \epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\gamma$ 137.9; cf. Gen. 2.21 f.), and close up Adam's flesh. "And Adam became completely psychic" ($\delta\epsilon\omega \alpha\delta\alpha\mu \psi\omega\tau\epsilon \bar{\mu}\psi\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma \tau\eta\rho\bar{\upsilon}$, 137.10 f.). I.e. his "spiritual" essence has been withdrawn by the creation of Eve from his rib! But once again his $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is restored, when the "spiritual woman" ($\tau\epsilon\gamma\iota\mu\epsilon \bar{\mu}\pi\nu\epsilon\chi\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\eta$) comes to Adam and says, "Get up, Adam!" Adam replies, "You are the one who has given me the life; you shall be called the 'Mother of the Living'" ($\tau\mu\alpha\delta\epsilon \bar{\mu}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu\gamma$, 137.14 f.; cf. Gen. 2.23 and 3.20).

This myth is actually framed in such a manner that--though based on other texts from Genesis as well--it becomes an epexegetical comment on Genesis 2.7, i.e. on how man has derived his spiritual nature. Once the

Father McRae for permitting me to see his dissertation, soon to be published by Cambridge University Press.

πνεῦμα, standing over against the ψυχή created by the archons, has been identified with the female figure of Wisdom (the Mother) as a spiritual projection of Eve, the handling of these texts in such a manner becomes understandable.

The text continues to comment upon further passages from the opening chapters of Genesis, but for our purposes it suffices to say, in summary, that the use of the terms πνευματικός and (particularly) ψυχικός in Hypostasis of the Archons occurs in the vicinity of the document's exegetical comment upon the text of Genesis 2.7. Traditional exegesis of Genesis 2.7 has, however, been overlaid with new interpretations peculiar to this document.

The Untitled Text, Codex II

The so-called Untitled Text from Chenoboskion¹ is in many respects a companion document to Hypostasis of the Archons, and there are many parallel passages between them. But the Untitled Text is a much further developed--

1. Ed., A. Böhlig, Die Koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi (Berlin, 1962). See pp. 19-35 for a good introduction to the material.

and much less unified¹--document than Hypostasis of the Archons, and is probably quite late (mid-third century?).

The passage which reflects an exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is 162.29-164.8:²

From that day on the seven archons fashioned (ῥηλασσε) the man; his body was like their body, but his appearance (πεψεινε) was like the Man which had been revealed to them.³ His formation (πεψπιδου) was accomplished partially by each of them, but their chief created the brain and the marrow. Then he made his appearance, as <the one> before him; he became a psychic man (αψωπε νορπωμε ψυχικος) and was called Adam, i.e. "the Father," according to the name of the one before him (162.29-163.3).

There are numerous points of contact with other gnostic systems treated above; the only new item is the

1. On the source analysis, see Böhlig, pp. 26 ff. et passim. The source problems in this document are almost insoluble.

2. Cf. 160.30-161.5 which probably comes from a different source (Böhlig, p. 29), but which contains the exhortation to the archons based on Gen. 1.26; cf. HA 135.23-26. Something like this should be understood as having preceded the passage quoted above. Preceding that would belong the blasphemy of the Demiurge and his rebuke, followed by the appearance of the "image." The "blasphemy" occurs at 151.2-32 and again at 155.17-156.2, but in material reflecting different sources. Cf. Böhlig, p. 29.

3. Cf. the appearance of the Light-Adam at 156.2-157.1, a passage which shows many similarities to the Manichaeian cosmogony (Böhlig, pp. 58-61). Note that the εἰκὼν was feminine in HA, but masculine in the Untitled Text.

spurious explanation of the name "Adam." The text of Genesis 2.7 is in the background: $\bar{\rho}\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ reflecting $\epsilon\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ and $\Delta\psi\omega\omega\pi\epsilon$ $\nu\sigma\tau\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ $\bar{\mu}\psi\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ reflecting $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\omicron$ (b) $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\acute{\nu}$ But the distinction between the $\pi\nu\omicron\eta$ / $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ has become obscured, as is evident from what follows (163.3-164.8):

When they had finished Adam, they put him in a vessel ($\bar{\nu}\nu\omicron\sigma\tau\kappa\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$), for he had been formed like these abortions,¹ having no spirit ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$) in him. For that reason the chief archon was afraid, as he thought about the word of Pistis,² lest the true (Man) come to his creature ($\pi\epsilon\psi\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$) and rule over him. Therefore he left his creature ($\pi\epsilon\psi\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$) forty days without soul ($\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\psi\iota\chi\eta$), departed and left him. But during these forty days Sophia-Zoe sent her breath to Adam ($\Delta\tau\omicron\sigma\phi\iota\delta$ $\bar{\nu}\omega\eta$ $\tau\bar{\nu}\nu\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ $\bar{\mu}\pi\epsilon\sigma\nu\iota\psi\epsilon$ $\epsilon\theta\omicron\tau\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$, cf. Gen. 2.7), in whom was no soul. He began to move on the ground, but was unable to get up. When the seven archons came and saw him, they were very disturbed. They came to him, grasped him, and said to the breath ($\bar{\mu}\pi\nu\iota\psi\epsilon$ = $\pi\nu\omicron\eta$) that was in him, "Who are you? And whence have you come to this place?" He answered and said, "I come from the power ($\tau\delta\iota\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$) of the Man for the purpose of destroying your work." When they heard that, they gave glory to him because he had given them rest ($\bar{\mu}\tau\omicron\nu$) from their fear and anxiety. Then they called that day "the Rest" ($\tau\delta\iota\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$), for they had rested from their trouble.³ When they saw that Adam could not

1. The archons. Cf. also 147.9,26; and the creation of Ialdabaoth in HA 142.14-19.

2. Cf. 151.17-28.

3. Perhaps the logical anomaly created by this statement can be alleviated by transferring it to a point after the next sentence!

get up, they were glad. They took him and placed him in Paradise (Gen. 2.15), and returned to their heaven. After the day of rest Sophia sent Zoe, her daughter, who was called Eve (cf. Gen. 3.20 Ζωή; 4.1 'Eva) as instructor (πεγυταμο)¹ to raise up Adam, in-whom there was no soul (ψυχή), so that those whom he would beget might become a vessel of light (Νόστος ἡπτοχρ[εῖν]). When Eve saw her fellow-image (πρωτοβρ εἶνε) lying prostrate, she had compassion for him, and said, "Adam, live! Get up off the ground!" Immediately her word became a deed. For Adam stood up, he straightway opened his eyes. And when he saw her, he said, "You shall be called 'the Mother of the living' (Τμάδαι ἡνετον? cf. Gen. 3.20) because you have given me life."

Here the πνεῦμα and the ψυχή are equated. The surprising thing is that when Sophia-Zoe comes and gives her breath (Νύε = πνοή) to Adam--an idea which reflects Genesis 2.7b--he still remains "without soul," unable to raise himself up from the ground,² and that in spite of the

1. On the etymological connection between Eve and "instructor" (/777 connected with Aramaic /77 "to instruct"), see Böhlig's note, p. 73. The term is also used of the θηρίον in Paradise (Gen. 3.1): 162.2-4; 167.7; 168.2 f. On the etymological connection between the θηρίον, i.e. the serpent (cf. Aram. /77, "animal" and /77 "serpent") and the function of the "instructor" see Böhlig's note, p. 74. IN HA the role of the serpent and the "spiritual woman" are amalgamated: 137.31 f.; 138.11. Cf. also Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.30.15, where Sophia is brought into close connection with the serpent.

2. A motif we have already seen with Saturninus and other texts; see above.

fact that the πνον' comes from the δύναις above.¹

The passage is understandable only on the basis of the parallel passage in Hypostasis of the Archons wherein Adam is enlivened ultimately by the coming of the "spiritual woman." It is, indeed, a fanciful enlargement of the tradition which occurs in Hypostasis of the Archons. The personified πνεῦμα of Hypostasis of the Archons, there equated with Sophia, is split into two in the Untitled Text. Sophia-Zoe, already a spiritual projection of Eve, and Zoe-Eve, the "daughter" of Sophia, are thus differentiated. As in Hypostasis of the Archons, the first inbreathing of Genesis 2.7 is ineffectual, and it is only when Zoe-Eva comes to Adam and commands him to get up that he is able to rise up and recognize that he has received life.

In short, older traditions of interpretation are here included, but are to some extent no longer functioning in their original meanings, because of newer interpretations and re-mythifications.

The πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology occurs in two other passages. In 165.28-166.6 three Adams are

1. Cf., e.g., Saturninus; above, p. 158.

mentioned; and in 170.6-33 "three men and their generations," pneumatic, psychic, and earthly, are compared to "the three phoenixes of Paradise." But the only passage which really deals with the gnostic group out of which the document as a whole arises, i.e. the μακάριοι who possess γνῶσις (172.11 f.), sets this class over against the three classes of men mentioned before. The passage (172.30-173.14) reads as follows:

They have found that they each have a seed over against the seed of the powers which has been mixed with it.¹ For the Savior² has formed each one individually in all of them, and their spirits are manifested as elect and blessed, and they are distinct according to the elections, along with many others who are without a king (ἐξο ματρηρο), superior to everyone before. So there are four classes (ἑστέ οἱ ἡτοορ ἡτενοε ὡωπ). Three belong to the kings of the ogdoad (ἀνρρωορ ἡτμδρωμορνε). But the fourth class is a perfect, kingless one which is higher than all of them. For these will enter into the holy place of their Father and will come to rest in rest, in eternal inexpressible glory and in imperishable joy. They are the kings, immortal though in mortality. They shall condemn the gods of chaos and their powers.

The three Adams and the three generations have given way to a new γένος, not πνευματικόν, ψυχικόν, or

1. Cf. 172.24.

2. Jesus Christ? He is referred to only once, at 153.26, where he is called σωτήρ.

χοϊκόν, but ἀβασίλευτον.¹ One terminology has been discarded for another, and that in a way which suggests a polemic against Gnostics who use the other terminology. Is the Untitled Text, i.e., its latest redaction, a witness to a rivalry between gnostic sects, those represented in this writing (who are they?) and . . . the Valentinians?

The Valentinian Literature

For the Valentinians the classification of mankind into the three categories, πνευματικοί, ψυχικοί, and χοϊκοί (ὕλικοί), lay at the very base of their theology, "indispensable à l'intelligence de la gnose valentinienne."² This classification undoubtedly goes back to Valentinus himself, for Valentinus is said to have written a treatise περὶ τῶν τριῶν φύσεων.³

1. A designation found in various gnostic documents, e.g. Apoc Ad 82.19 f.; HA 145.4; SJC 92.4-7; Naassenes, Hipp. Ref. 5.8.1; cf. also Codex Bruce 42. In the Liturgy in the Apostolic Constitutions 8.5.1, the term is used of God: ὁ θεός . . . ὁ μόνος ἀβασίλευτος. See PGL ad loc.

2. F. Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne, p. 139.

3. Anthimus, De sancta ecclesia 9; cf. Voelker, Quellen, p. 60. The as-yet-unpublished fourth treatise of the Jung Codex (cf. F. L. Cross, ed., The Jung Codex [London, 1955], p. 19, where Puech refers to this document

A complete description here of the Valentinian anthropology is not possible, nor is it needed, since much has been written on Valentinianism. What I shall do, therefore, is discuss how the πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology is related to the Valentinian exegesis of Genesis 2.7.¹ In this area, I believe, new ground can be broken.

I begin with a passage from the Valentinian myth as preserved by Irenaeus,² with which I shall compare a

as the "Treatise on the Three Natures") cannot, according to G. Quispel (in an oral communication) be identified with the treatise by Valentinus of the same name. Quispel seems to think that the document in the Jung Codex should be ascribed to Heracleon. But it is useless to discuss this further until the text is published. For the fullest discussion of the document, see J. Zandee, The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, Mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex (Istanbul, 1961).

1. On Valentinian gnosticism, see especially F. Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne; and H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, I, 362-375; and 408-418; also The Gnostic Religion, pp. 174-205. For a good treatment of Valentinian anthropology, see G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose Valentinienne," Eranos Jb 15 (1947), 249-286.

2. Probably reflecting the doctrine of Ptolemy; cf. Förster, Von Valentin zu Herakleon (Giessen, 1928), p. 84, et passim; C. Barth, Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis (TU 37.3; Leipzig, 1911), p. 11; F. Sagnard, La gnose, p. 232.

parallel passage from the Excerpta ex Theodoto.¹ Much of this material (though how much is impossible to say) goes back to Valentinus himself.² I have already treated a fragment of Valentinus which contained speculation on Genesis 2.7³ and reflected earlier gnostic tradition.

It is universally recognized that the Valentinian myth is based essentially on an older gnostic myth resembling that of the Apocryphon of John.⁴ What is presented by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria (Exc. Th.), and even Hippolytus, is a more highly developed system, Christianized, and reflecting the philosophical milieu of the Hellenistic world; particularly Alexandria.⁵

1. Exc. Th. 43-65 runs parallel at many points to Adv. Haer. 1.4.1-1.6.3. Both are dependent on a common source, according to O. Dibelius, ZNW 9 (1908), 230 ff. Cf. G. Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," VigChr 1 (1947), 44 f.

2. So also F. Sagnard, La gnose, p. 232. See also G. Quispel's attempt to reconstruct "the original doctrine of Valentine," cited in previous note.

3. See above, p. 177.

4. See e.g. F. Sagnard, La gnose, p. 446; Förster, Von Valentin, p. 98; Jonas, Gnostic Religion, p. 301. See also the testimony of the Fathers on the origins of Valentinian gnosticism: Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.11.1; 1.30.15; and 1.31.3; Tertullian Adv. Val. 39; Hippolytus Ref. 6.42.2.

5. Cf. Quispel, VigChr 1 (1947), 47; and especially Sagnard, La gnose, pp. 567-618.

I quote first from Irenaeus. In the preceding context (1.5.4) it is stated that the Demiurge performed his creative work in the mistaken idea that he was the only god, saying "through the prophets": ἐγὼ θεός, πλὴν ἐμοῦ οὐδεὶς (Is. 45.5; 46.9). This is, of course, a traditional feature, belonging to a pre-Valentinian stage in the myth.¹ The text follows (1.5.5-6):²

5. When he had fashioned the world, he made the earthy (χοϊκόν) man also, not from this dry earth, but from the invisible substance, taking from the liquid and fluid (part) of matter. And into him he breathed the psychic man (καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἐμφυσῆσαι τὸν ψυχικόν). And this is the one who was made 'according to the image and likeness' (Gen. 1.26); 'according to the image' is the hylic, similar to, but not of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) as God; but 'according to the likeness' is the psychic, whence also his substance is called πνεῦμα ζωῆς, since it is from a pneumatic emanation. Afterward he clothed him with the coat of skin (cf. Gen. 3.21); this is the flesh of sense-perception.

1. As can be seen from the texts treated above. Cf. Hipp. Ref. 6.33, where the Demiurge is referred to as ἄνους καὶ μωρός reminding us of the name "Saclas" which is given to the Demiurge in other systems (cf. AJ, C II 59.15-18). Cf. also Exc. Th. 49.1, where in the same context Rom. 8.20 is quoted and adapted: ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι τοῦ κόσμου, οὐχ ἐκὼν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα. In EV the blasphemy and ignorance of the Demiurge can be seen behind the figure of Πλάνη; see especially EV 17.14-21.

2. Omitting such additions as διορίζονται, λέγουσιν ὡς φασί, etc.

6. The embryo of their mother Achamoth which she had conceived according to the vision of the angels around the Savior, being pneumatic of the same substance as the Mother (ὁμοούσιον ὑπάρχον τῇ Μητρὶ πνευματικόν) the Demiurge did not know, and it was secretly put into him (i.e. Adam) without his knowledge, in order that through him it might be sown into the soul from him and into the hylic body, and growing and increasing in them it might be ready for the reception of the perfect Logos. The Demiurge was unaware of the pneumatic man which was sown with his inbreathing by Sophia with ineffable power and foreknowledge. As he was ignorant of the Mother, so also is he ignorant of her seed, which is the Ecclesia, corresponding to the Ecclesia above. . . . So they have the soul from the Demiurge, the body from the earth (ἀπὸ τοῦ γοός), the flesh from matter, but the pneumatic man from the Mother Achamoth.

Parallel to this is the account in Excerpta ex Theodoto 50.1-55.1, although it is broken up with further comment on the basis of sayings of the Savior and quotations from Paul. I present only the material parallel to the passage quoted above:¹

50.1-3. 'Taking dust from the earth'--not from the dry ground, but a part of the manifold and complex matter--he created an earthly and hylic soul, irrational and of the same substance with that of the beasts. This is the man 'according to the image' (Gen. 1.26). But the man 'according to the likeness,' the likeness of the Demiurge himself, is that one which he has breathed and sowed into the former, having placed

1. Based on the text as edited by F. Sagnard, Extraits de Théodote (Sources Chrétiennes 23; Paris, 1948).

into him something of the same substance with the help of the angels. As he is invisible and incorporeal he called his substance πνοὴ ζῶσα. As something formed (μορφωθέν) it became a ψυχὴ ζῶσα. This he says himself in the prophetic scriptures.

53.2-5. Adam had, unbeknownst to him, the pneumatic seed sown by Sophia into the soul. . . . For as the Demiurge, who is moved by Sophia without his knowledge, thinks that he is self-moving, similarly also men. Therefore Sophia first put forth the pneumatic seed which is in Adam, in order that it might be 'the bone' (τὸ ὀστούν, Gen. 2.23),¹ the rational and heavenly soul, not empty, but full of pneumatic marrow.

55.1. Upon Adam, over the three incorporeal elements, was put on a fourth, the earthy (ὁ χοϊκός), as the 'garments of skins' (Gen. 3.21).²

A third version is preserved by Hippolytus, representing a separate stream of the Valentinian system (Ref. 6.34.4-6):³

From the hylic and diabolical substance the Demiurge made the bodies for the souls. This is what is said, "and God fashioned the man, taking dust from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life; and the man became a living

1. Cf. HA 137.9 and the speculation on the spiritual nature of the rib taken from Adam; and see below.

2. One would expect here, as in Adv. Haer. 1.5.5, the σάρκινος. But Exc. Th. does have this speculation on Gen. 3.21 at a more logical place, i.e. at the end.

3. On the system represented by Hippolytus, see C. Barth, Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis, p. 27, and Förster, Von Valentin, p. 100.

soul" (Gen. 2.7). This is the inner man, the psychic dwelling in the hylic body, which is hylic, perishable, completely fashioned out of diabolical substance (ἐκ τῆς διαβολικῆς οὐσίας πεπλασμένος). This hylic man is like an inn or dwelling, sometimes of the soul alone, sometimes of the soul and demons, sometimes of the soul and logoi¹ which are the logoi sown from above (ἄνωθεν κατεσπαρμένοι) into this world from Karpos, unity of the Pleroma and Sophia, dwelling in the earthy body (ἐν σώματι χοϊκῷ) with the soul, whenever the demons are not dwelling with the soul.²

The terminology used in the Valentinian versions of the myth is heavily overlaid with the jargon of Hellenistic philosophy (mainly Middle-Platonic), and is considerably influenced by Plato's Timaeus and contemporary speculation thereon.³ In addition to such obvious terms as Δημιουργός, ὕλη, etc., note the following examples:

1. I.e. the ἄγγελοι ἐπουράνιοι (34.3).

2. This passage is dependent upon Valentinus' metaphor of the heart as an inn (πανδοχεῖον) which is sometimes occupied by unclean spirits, but which can be purified by God through the Son; see Fr. 2, Voelker, Quellen, p. 58.

3. This represents a secondary philosophizing of a more primitive exegetical tradition which was already influenced by Hellenistic philosophy. Philo, a century earlier than Valentinus, is a good example of the influence of Hellenistic philosophy on his exegesis of Genesis, as we have already seen. On the influence of the Timaeus on Valentinian doctrine, see the remarks of Hippolytus, Ref. 6.22.1: ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ τῷ Πλάτῳ σοφία Αἰγυπτίων

Adv. Haer. 1.5.5: ἀπὸ τῆς ἀοράτου οὐσίας.

Cf. Plato, Timaeus 51a on the ὑποδοχή of the generated world as ἀνόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον.¹

Adv. Haer.: ἀπὸ τοῦ κεχυμένου² καὶ βευστοῦ τῆς ὕλης.

Cf. Damascius on Archytas, Diels-Kranz, Vorsokratiker, I, 425, 1.18 f.: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἀρχυτείοις ιστορεῖ καὶ Πυθαγόραν ἄλλο τὴν ὕλην καλεῖν ὡς βευστὴν καὶ αἰεὶ ἄλλο <καὶ ἄλλο> γιγνόμενον.

Sextus Pyrrhus on Protagoras, Diels-Kranz, Vorsokratiker, II, 258: φησὶν οὖν ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὕλην βευστὴν εἶναι. Also Numenius, Fr. 30, from Chalcidius in Timaeum, Leemans (ed.), p. 92, 1.18 f.: Igitur Pythagoras quoque, inquit, fluidam et sine qualitate silvam esse censet

Exc. Theod. 50.1: ἀλλὰ τῆς πολυμερούς καὶ ποικίλης ὕλης μέρος. Cf. Plato, Timaeus 50d: ποικίλου πάσας ποικιλίας. Cf. also the Chaldaean Oracles, Kroll (ed.), p. 20: πολυποικίλου ὕλης.³

1. Plato does not use the term ὕλη. Cf. F. Cornford, Plato's Cosmology, The Timaeus of Plato (Indianapolis [n. d.]), p. 181.

2. Probably a play on χούς in Gen. 2.7, a noun related to the verb χέω. Thus a distinction is made between the χούς of Gen. 2.7 and the ξηρά of Gen. 1.10.

3. See H. Lewy, The Chaldaean Oracles, p. 118 and

Exc. Theod. 53.4: κινούμενος . . . αὐτοκίνητος.

Cf. Aristotle, Physics 258a and his discussion whether the first cause can be κινούμενος or even αὐτοκίνητος. (He rejects both in favor of the ἄκινητος Mover).

Exc. Theod. 50.1; 53.5: ψυχὴν . . . ἄλογον;

ἡ λογικὴ . . . ψυχὴ. Cf. Numenius, Fr. 36, Leemans (ed.), p. 98, 1.24 f.: δύο ψυχάς . . . τὴν μὲν λογικὴν, τὴν δὲ ἄλογον.

Exc. Theod. 53.5: ἀλλὰ μυελοῦ γέμουσα πνευματικοῦ.

Cf. Plato, Timaeus 73bc on μυελός and its relation to θεῖον σπέρμα.

Hipp. Ref. 6.34.4: ἐκ τῆς ὑλικῆς οὐσίας.

Cf. Galen περὶ πλήθους 3, von Arnim SVF II, 144, 1.25-27: ὡς οἱ Στωϊκοί, τὸ μὲν συνέχον ἕτερον ποιοῦσι τὸ συνεχόμενον δὲ ἄλλο. τὴν μὲν γὰρ πνευματικὴν οὐσίαν τὸ συνέχον, τὴν δὲ ὑλικὴν τὸ συνεχόμενον.

Beneath the philosophical dilettantism displayed in these passages, all three of them are based ultimately

p. 297, n. 143. On the relation of the Chaldaean Oracles to Middle Platonism, see his discussion pp. 312 ff.

on the same mythopoeic interpretation of Genesis 2.7 familiar to us from the Apocryphon of John and other gnostic texts. The Demiurge (= Ialdabaoth) with his angels fashions a man from the dust of the ground. Sophia works secretly through the Demiurge to get him to breathe into the man the substance from above. This he does unbeknownst to himself, in addition to the inbreathing of the ψυχικός substance proper to his own existence. Thus man has within himself a πνευματικὸν σπέρμα, a πνευματικὴ ἀπόρροια¹ and is to that extent greater than the Creator. The ἐμφύσημα of Genesis 2.7 bears a double function: it is the means by which the Demiurge endows man with his ψυχικός existence (ψυχή), and it is the means whereby Sophia endows man with his πνευματικός existence (πνεῦμα). It is the πνευματικὴ ἀπόρροια "sown along with" the Demiurge's ἐμφύσημα.²

1. Cf. Exc. Th. 2.1-2, where the term ἀπόρροια is also used of the πνευματικὸν σπέρμα. On the term ἀπόρροια see now H. Dörrie, "Emanation. Ein unphilosophisches Wort im spätantiken Denken," in Parusia. Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus, pp. 119-141.

2. Cf. Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.5.6: συγκατασπαρεῖς τῷ ἐμφυσήματι αὐτοῦ. See also Heracleon, Fr. 16, Brooke, p. 71, 1.9: τὸ ἐμφύσημα καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἐμφυσήματι σπέρμα.

One new feature in the Valentinian material is the use of the term σπέρμα, and the verbs σπείρω, ἐνσπείρω, κατασπείρω, etc. This terminology arises in the context of the Valentinian exegesis of Genesis 2.7, in conjunction with the ἐμφύσημα,¹ but one must look outside the book of Genesis for its origin.

Here again the influence of Plato's Timaeus comes to the fore. For in the Timaeus (especially in 41CD) it is stated that the Demiurge sowed the immortal part of man's soul as a seed, which was then encapsulated by the gods to whom he delegated the work of creating the mortal part of man. Of course the Valentinians "correct" Plato's account--as they do the Genesis account--by denying to the Demiurge the role of providing man with the immortal seed. This function is reserved for Sophia, and in this the Valentinians follow the older gnostic myth. The introduction of the σπέρμα terminology is Valentinian, and based on the Timaeus.

It should also be remarked that all three aspects of man's existence, πνευματικός, ψυχικός, and χοϊκός are

1. See already the fragment of Valentinus quoted above, p. 177 .

in reality understood as incorporeal elements of man's inner being (see especially Exc. Th. 50.3). The body is a fourth entity housing the tri-partite soul; this is clear from Exc. Th. 55.1 and the exegesis of Genesis 3.21.¹

It remains to inquire how it is that the Valentinians divide all of mankind into three different γένη, since in the myth thus far it is clear that all three aspects of human existence reside in one man. The answer is that only Adam represents in himself all three levels of existence, but the three sons of Adam represent the three types of men subsequently to be born:

From Adam three natures were begotten (τρεις φύσεις γεννῶνται); the first was the irrational (ἄλογος = χοϊκός, ὑλικός), represented by Cain; the second was the rational and righteous (λογικὴ καὶ ἡ δικαία),² represented by Abel; and the third was the pneumatic, represented by Seth (Exc. Th. 54.1).³

1. This understanding of Gen. 3.21 is known already to Philo, post Caini 137. On the tripartite soul, and other aspects of Valentinian anthropology, see G. Quispel, Eranos Jb 15, pp. 249-286.

2. This use of λογικὴ contradicts 53.5! The psychics, in order to be saved, need faith and righteousness (Adv. Haer. 1.6.2).

3. Seth is the representative of spiritual humanity in many gnostic systems. See above, p. 181 .n.3.

As a result men are referred to as οἱ πνευματικοί (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.6.1 et passim), οἱ ψυχικοί (Adv. Haer. 1.6.2 et passim), and οἱ χοϊκοί (Adv. Haer. 1.8.3), or υλικοί (Exc. Th. 56.2; Adv. Haer. 1.5.1; EV 31.4).¹ The use of the term υλικός as a synonym for χοϊκός reflects a philosophical usage.²

According to the Valentinians most men are "hylic"; less are "psychic"; and only a few are "pneumatic" (Exc. Th. 56.2). The "pneumatics" are "saved by nature" (φύσει σωζόμενοι, Exc. Th. 56.3; Adv. Haer. 1.6.2).³ The "hylics" cannot be saved at all; they "perish by nature" (φύσει ἀπόλλυται, Exc. Th. 56.3), for τὸ χοϊκὸν ἀδύνατον σωτηρίας (Adv. Haer. 1.6.2). The "psychics" occupy a position midway between the "pneumatics" and the "hylics," and can extend in either direction--toward salvation or

1. At EV 31.4 the word *ΘΥΛΗ* must be taken on the basis of the plural verb *μεμψορκοῦνται* to reflect the Greek οἱ υλικοί.

2. See above all the Hermetic distinction between the υλικός and the ἔννοος ἄνθρωπος, CH 9.5.

3. According to Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 4.13.89) Basilides as well as Valentinus taught a φύσει σωζόμενον γένος. In the Valentinian system salvation is effected by μόρφωσις or τελείωσις in γνῶσις, and is thoroughly Christocentric. See on this F. Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne, pp. 400 ff., and G. Quispel, Eranos Jb 15, pp. 274 ff.

destruction--according to their will and inclination. In order to be saved they require "faith" and "righteousness" (Adv. Haer. 1.6.2).¹

The three classes of men also receive other designations in Valentinian literature. The "pneumatics" are referred to as the *ἐκλεκτοί* (Exc. Th. 1.2; 39; etc.) and the *ἐκλογή* (Exc. Th. 21.1; Heracleon Fr. 37). The *ψυχικοί* are called the *κλητοί* (Exc. Th. 39) and the *κλησίς* (Exc. Th. 21.1; Heracleon Fr. 13 and 27). This terminology reflects what appears to be an exegesis of Matthew 22.14.² Herein is a clue to the rigid system of classification employed by the Valentinians: it is a Jewish-apocalyptic doctrine of predestination understood in categories of *φύσις* and *οὐσία*!

The ultimate origin of the *πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός* terminology in Valentinian gnosticism is, as we have seen, a particular understanding of Genesis 2.7,

1. That is not to say that the "psychics" participate in the same kind or degree of salvation as do the "pneumatics." On the destiny of the saved "psychics" see F. Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne, pp. 397 ff. Of course the "psychics" are the members of the non-gnostic catholic church!

2. So also F. Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne, p. 303, n. 1.

already existing before the Valentinian system. This terminology the Valentinians took over and expanded, so that it is difficult to place one's finger on the locus of this terminology in the Valentinian system as a whole, unless one has studied its pre-history in the context of exegesis of Genesis 2.7.

Indeed, the Valentinians themselves probably forgot the ultimate source of their terminology. At one point, at any rate, they attribute it to Paul:

And Paul very clearly spoke of the choics, psychics, and pneumatics, when he said, οἶος ὁ χοϊκός, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ χοϊκοί, and where he said, ψυχικός δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, and where he said, πνευματικός ἀνακρίνει τὰ πάντα (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.8.3).¹

This brings us full circle, back to the usage of the Corinthian opponents and the appropriation of their terminology by Paul. In the concluding chapter we shall delineate the points of continuity--and discontinuity--between the theology and anthropology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul and the speculations of the various gnostic groups treated in this chapter.

1. The Pauline passages are 1 Cor. 15.48; 1 Cor. 2.14; and 1 Cor. 2.15. 1 Cor. 2.14 is also cited in Hippolytus' account at Ref. 6.34.8.

Chapter VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RAMIFICATIONS

Is there any continuity between the use of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology on the part of Paul's Corinthian opponents and the use of the same terminology by the various gnostic groups studied in the previous chapter? Can the opponents of Paul be described as "Gnostics" on the basis of their use of this terminology? The first question must receive a positive answer. There is, indeed, such a continuity. But it remains to define with precision what that continuity is.

It has been established above that the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology arises in the context of a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7, and that the use of the terminology by the Corinthian opponents must be understood against that religions-historical background. One can perhaps term that sphere of ideas "Hellenistic-Jewish

wisdom speculation" or "Hellenistic-Jewish speculative mysticism."¹ Basic to this wisdom theology, or "speculative mysticism," is the sharp distinction between the higher, heavenly realm and the earthly realm, between the higher πνεῦμα or πνευματικός nature of man, and his lower ψυχή or ψυχικός nature. A similar dualism occurs in Gnosticism and is similarly tied to an exegesis of Genesis 2.7, a crucial text as we have seen for gnostic speculation. To that extent the Gnostics--at least those who use the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology--and the Corinthian opponents of Paul are on common ground, since they share not only a common terminology, a common scripture-text, but also a common dualism. As we have seen, Paul can accommodate himself to the terminology of his Corinthian opponents, though he re-interprets it in categories derived from a Jewish-apocalyptic background and from primitive-Christian eschatology.

1. "Hellenistisch-jüdische spekulative Mystik," a phrase used by D. Georgi in his study of the religious-historical background of the hymn in Philippians 2, in Zeit und Geschichte; see especially p. 268. Georgi rightly understands this as a matrix (he would see it as the matrix) out of which Gnosticism develops, but he has not precisely enough defined at what point such mysticism becomes "Gnosticism." See below.

But to the second question posed above, whether the Corinthian opponents--and Paul himself, for he uses their terminology--can be characterized as "Gnostics," a negative answer must be given. It is at this point that more precision is required than has usually been the case heretofore. It has already been shown above that the πνεῦμα-ψυχή differentiation is basically a Jewish version of the νοῦς-ψυχή differentiation of common Hellenistic parlance. Indeed, there is a sense in which "Hellenistic-Jewish speculative mysticism," including the anthropological speculations of the Corinthian opponents of Paul, can be said to belong to the mainstream of what has been called "the spirit of late antiquity."¹ It is indeed a Jewish by-product of, and dialogue with, the dominant world-view of late antiquity, a world-view characterized by a marked pessimism vis-à-vis earthly existence and a longing for the purer etherēal regions of pure spirit above.² The point at issue, therefore,

1. The phrase ("spätantiker Geist") belongs to Hans Jonas. It seems to me that Jonas' later writings on Gnosticism are better, because more precise, than his epoch-making Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, first published in 1934.

2. See now E. R. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety (Cambridge, 1965). In addition to the general

revolves around the definition of "Gnosticism." In my opinion to define "Gnosticism" as "the spirit of late antiquity" is not to define it at all.

Now in spite of the continuities noted between the speculations of the Corinthian opponents of Paul and the various gnostic groups treated in the previous chapter, the differences between them are so marked as to be decisive. For inasmuch as the Gnostics separate the πνευματικός nature of man from the realm of God's activity as Creator, inasmuch as they posit man's ψυχικός or χοϊκός nature as the product of an inferior or fallen being working in defiance of, or in ignorance of, the highest Deity, the continuity between the Corinthian opponents of Paul and the Gnostics has been broken. The speculations of the opponents of Paul in Corinth cannot successfully be placed in the same category as those treated in Chapter Six. In fine, the Corinthian opponents of Paul were not "Gnostics."¹

"disjointedness" of the times, a very important factor in this common world view was the prevailing "scientific" view of the universe held by astronomers, astrologers, and philosophers. On this see M. P. Nilsson, "The New Conception of the Universe in Late Greek Paganism," Eranos 44 (1946), 20-27; see also Geschichte der Griechischen Religion, II, 702-711.

1. See above, especially pp. 119 ff.

What, then, is "Gnosticism"? Indeed, I believe this investigation has contributed to a better understanding of what "Gnosticism" is, in that it has corroborated what was set forth as a tentative definition in Chapter One. Especially to the point were the remarks by Hans Jonas quoted there¹ concerning the derivative character of gnostic mythology. This has been everywhere the case in our study of the gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7. Older traditions of exegesis--and an older terminology--have been taken over and re-interpreted to express something radically new and different, something which goes beyond the "spirit of late antiquity." For what is expressed in Gnosticism is not only a pessimism vis-à-vis the world, but a positive revulsion of, and hostility against, the world and its fallen creator(s). Concomitantly there is expressed in Gnosticism a defiant exaltation of man's ego to the status of godhead. The world and earthly existence is viewed as the product of a tragic fall within the Deity, and salvation consists in a reversal of this fall, the restoration of man's ego to the divine fulness whence it

1. See p. 10.

emanated. And this salvation is accomplished through
 γνῶσις.

As has been observed, this gnosis takes on multifarious forms, so that one cannot in any sense define what is "gnostic" simply on the basis of mythological motifs or terminologies. Gnosticism involves, therefore, a "new hermeneutic," a new way of looking at older traditions and older mythologies. The essence of this "new hermeneutic" is revolt.¹

What, precisely, is Gnosticism in revolt against? It is becoming more and more clear that the revolt is basically and primitively against Judaism.² And it is this insight, in my opinion, that offers the possibility of solving the long-standing riddle of the origins of Gnosticism.³ This dissertation has broken new ground in

1. See H. Jonas' contribution in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, pp. 286-293, and also his paper read at Messina, in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, pp. 101 f.; and see now especially G. McRae's dissertation, "Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature," I, 290, et passim.

2. Perceived by Jonas, but he does not draw the proper historical and genetic conclusion from this observation; McRae has perceived the matter correctly. See below.

3. For a good recent summary of the scholarly discussion of this question, see Bo Frid, "Diskussionen om gnosticismens uppkomst," STK 43 (1967), 169-185.

illuminating the origins of Gnosticism in that it has added new data to corroborate the view which is more and more coming to the fore; viz., that Gnosticism arises on Jewish soil out of a profound disillusionment with the God of the covenant, the God of time and history and the created order.¹ Our investigation of the Gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7 showed that this was a crucial text in the development of Gnostic anthropology; but further, it has been established that the Gnostics took over and re-interpreted older Jewish traditions of interpretation. There was in evidence what MacRae calls "a conscious perversion of the Jewish sources," and "a residual Jewish atmosphere that is only on the way to being overcome."² But, as MacRae also points out, there is no real "Jewish Gnosticism." When the Gnostics have added their new insights to the older materials, there emerges something which can no longer be called Judaism. "Out of the old materials a new religion emerges."³

1. MacRae's dissertation has gone a long way toward establishing this without further room for doubt.

2. MacRae, I, 301 f.

3. Ibid., p. 304.

Directions toward Further Research

In view of what has been said above, it is evident that Gnosticism is originally a non-Christian--and perhaps even pre-Christian--phenomenon. But from an early date there were also "Christian" Gnostics. In Christian Gnosticism the figure of Jesus Christ becomes of central importance in the drama of redemption included as part of the gnostic mythology.¹ Though the text of Genesis retains a central place in the Christian-gnostic speculation, Christian traditions and literature are also subjected to gnostic re-interpretation, and Christian apostles are venerated as authorities for their doctrines.

By far the most important apostolic authority for the Christian Gnostics was the apostle Paul. Examples of the use of Paul in gnostic sources are found in Chapter Six.² It is apparent that the Gnostics found Paul's

1. When this occurred cannot be answered with certainty. But see above, p.161 on Simon, Menander, and Saturninus. Haenchen is correct in his judgment that Simon Magus was never a Christian, and that the Acts narrative is in this respect unhistorical; see ZTK 49 (1952), 316-349.

2. E.g. the Simonians, p.165, the Naassenes, pp.186 ff.; Hypostasis of the Archons, p.201; and especially the Valentinians, p. 226.

language and terminology--some of which actually derives from Paul's opponents!--congenial for the expression of their own views. Indeed, it was already observed long ago that Paul could justifiably be termed the haereticorum apostolus.¹ Modern scholars, too, have noted the popularity of Paul amongst the Gnostics and have suggested that it is the connection between Gnosticism and Paul which made the apostle suspect in the catholic church of the mid-second century.² Some have even gone so far as to suggest that Gnosticism is the heir of Paul.³

Now that a greater understanding is being achieved concerning the nature of Gnosticism and its origins, and now that new sources have become available, there is evidently need for further research on the use and appropriation of Paul by the Gnostics of the second century. And concomitantly, there is also room for further study on

1. Tertullian, adv. Marc. 3.5. Tertullian refers to the appropriation of Paul by the Marcionites. On the Marcionite use of Paul, see the classic work of Adolf von Harnack, Marcion, Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott² (Leipzig, 1924; r.p. Darmstadt, 1960).

2. W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos⁵ (Göttingen, 1965), p. 192.

3. E. Aleith, Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche (Berlin, 1937), p. 40.

the use-~~or~~ non-use--of Paul on the part of "catholic" writers of the second century.¹ It is along these lines that I hope to continue my own research in the future.

1. The recent book by M. F. Wiles, The Divine Apostle, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church (Cambridge, 1967), only takes up from Irenaeus and thus omits a discussion of that obscure but crucial period preceding Irenaeus.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The first part contains the texts and, in some instances, the translations used in citing or quoting source material. I have also included English translations of ancient sources consulted in the preparation of my own translations. Entries are listed according to editor.

The second part contains only those books and articles cited in the dissertation. The absence of any particular book or article does not necessarily indicate that it has not been consulted. I have not included in the Bibliography the standard reference works, such as lexica, grammars, encyclopedias, etc. Some of these occur in the list of abbreviations.

A. Sources

Adam, Alfred. Texte zum Manichäismus. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 175.) Berlin, 1954.

Albeck, C. Bereschit Rabba. Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Berlin, 1929.

Arnim, Hans von. Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1905-24.

Baynes, Charlotte. A Coptic Gnostic Treatise Contained in the Codex Brucianus. Cambridge, 1933.

Blackman, Philip. Mishnayoth. 7 vols. London, 1951-56.

Böhlig, A., and P. Labib. Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi. Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Halle, 1963.

_____. Die Koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi. Berlin, 1962.

Brooke, A. E. The Fragments of Heracleon. Cambridge, 1891.

Burnet, John. Platonis Opera. 5 vols. Oxford, 1958. (First published in 1900.)

Casey, R. P. The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria. (Studies and Documents, 1.) London, 1934.

Chadwick, Henry. Origen: Contra Celsum. Cambridge, 1953.

Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford, 1913.

_____. The Ascension of Isaiah. London, 1900.

_____. The Book of Enoch. Oxford, 1912.

_____. The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch. Anecdota Oxoniensa. (Texts, Documents, and Extracts, Semitic Series, Part 11.) Oxford, 1906.

_____. The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Darmstadt, 1966. (First published in 1908: Oxford.)

- Cohn, Leopold, and Paul Wendland. Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt. 6 vols. Berlin, 1896-1915.
- Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker. Philo. 10 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1929-62.
- Cornford, Francis. Plato's Cosmology. The Timaeus of Plato. Indianapolis, n. d.
- Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. London, 1958.
- De Lacy, Phillip, and Benedict Einarson. Plutarch's Moralia. Vol. 7. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1959.
- Diels, Hermann, and Walther Kranz. Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. 3 vols. 7th ed. Berlin, 1954.
- Dietrich, Albrecht. Eine Mithrasliturgie. Darmstadt, 1966. (Reprint of 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1923.)
- Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. G. Vermes. Cleveland, 1962.
- Epstein, I. The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nezikin. London, 1935.
- Evans, Ernest. Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection. London, 1960.
- Freedman, H., and M. Simon. Midrash Rabbah. Vol. 1. London, 1939.
- Funk, F. X., and Karl Bihlmeyer. Die Apostolischen Väter. Tübingen, 1956.
- Giversen, Søren. Apocryphon Johannis. (Acta Theologica Danica, 5.) Copenhagen, 1963.
- Goodspeed, E. J. Die ältesten Apologeten. Göttingen, 1914.
- Grant, R. M. Gnosticism, an Anthology. London, 1961.

- Harvey, W. Wigan. Sancti Irenaei, Libros quinque adversus Haereses. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1857.
- Hennecke, Edgar, and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. New Testament Apocrypha. Trans. R. M. Wilson. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1963-65.
- Herford, R. Travers. The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers. New York, 1962.
- Holl, Karl. Epiphanius, Ancoratus und Panarion. 3 vols. (GCS 25, 31, 37.) Leipzig, 1915-33.
- James, M. R. Apocrypha Anecdota (Second Series.) (Texts and Studies, 1.) Cambridge, 1897.
- Kisch, Guido. Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. (Publications in Medieval Studies, University of Notre Dame, 10.) Notre Dame, Indiana, 1949.
- Koetschau, Paul. Gegen Celsus in Origines Werke. Vols. 1 and 2. (GCS) Leipzig, 1899.
- Krause, Martin, and P. Labib. Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo. (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Kopt. Reihe 1.) Wiesbaden, 1962.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. De Oraculis Chaldaicis. (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen, 7.1.) Breslau, 1894.
- Kroymann, Emil. Tertulliani Opera. Pars III. (CSEL, 47.) Leipzig, 1906.
- Labib, Pahor. Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo. Vol. 1 (no other volumes published). Cairo, 1961.
- Leemans, E.-A. Studie over den Wijsgeer Numenius van Apamea met Uitgave der Fragmenten. (Memoires de l'Acad. royale de Belgique, Cl. des Lettres, 37.2.) Brussels, 1937.
- Leipoldt, J., and H.-M. Schenke. Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi. Hamburg, 1960.

- Lidzbarski, Mark. Ginza. Göttingen, 1925.
- Lohse, Eduard. Die Texte aus Qumran. Darmstadt, 1964.
- Marcus, Ralph. Philo. Supplement, 2 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1953.
- Marquardt, Johannes. Observationes criticae in Cl. Galeni librum ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑΤΩΝ. Leipzig, 1870.
- Meritt, B. D. Corinth. Vol. 8.1, Greek Inscriptions. Cambridge, 1931.
- Nestle, E., and K. Aland. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. Stuttgart, 1963.
- Nock, A. D., and A.-J. Festugière. Corpus Hermeticum. 4 vols. Paris, 1945-54.
- Nock, A. D. Sallustius. Concerning the Gods and the Universe. Hildesheim, 1966. (First published in 1926: Cambridge.)
- Oldfather, W. A. Epictetus. The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments. 2 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1961.
- Preisendanz, Karl. Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1928-31.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1952.
- Reider, Joseph. The Book of Wisdom. (Dropsie College Edition, Jewish Apocryphal Literature.) New York, 1957.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. (American Edition, 10 vols.) Grand Rapids, n. d.
- Rose, Valentine. Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta. Leipzig, 1886.
- Ross, W. D. Aristotle's Physics. Oxford, 1955.

Sagnard, F. Clément d'Alexandrie Extraits de Théodote.
(Sources Chrétiennes, 23.) Paris, 1948.

Smith, Joseph P. St. Irenaeus. Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. (Ancient Christian Writers, 16)
Westminster, Maryland, 1952.

Sperber, Alexander. The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. 1: The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos. Leiden, 1959.

Stearns, W. N. Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers.
Chicago, 1908.

Thackeray, H. St. J., and Louis Feldman. Josephus.
9 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge,
Mass., 1926-65.

Theodoret of Cyrus. Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium.
In J. P. Migne. Patrologiae Graecae. Vol. 83,
cols. 335-556. Paris, 1864.

Till, Walter C. Das Evangelium nach Philippos.
(Patristische Texte und Studien, 2.) Berlin, 1963.

_____. Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502. (TU 60.5.) Berlin, 1955.

Völker, Walther. Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis. Tübingen, 1932.

Vogel, C. J. de. Greek Philosophy. A Collection of Texts.
Vol. 3: The Hellenistic-Roman Period. 2nd ed.
Leiden, 1964.

Wendland, Paul. Hippolytus Werke. Vol. 3: Refutatio omnium Haeresium. (GCS, 26.) Leipzig, 1916.

Ziegler, Joseph. Sapientia Salomonis. (Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum, 12.1.) Göttingen, 1962.

B. Literature

Aleith, Eva. Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche.
Berlin, 1937.

Almqvist, Helge. Plutarch und das Neue Testament.
Uppsala, 1946.

Barth, Carola. Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments
in der Valentinianischen Gnosis. (TU 37.3.)
Leipzig, 1911.

Benoit, P. "L'inscription grecque du tombeau de Jason,"
IEJ 17 (1967), 112-113.

Bianchi, Ugo. "Le colloque international sur les origines
du gnosticisme (Messine, Avril 1966)," Numen 13
(1966), 151-160.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. Göttingen,
1907.

_____. Die Himmelsreise der Seele. Darmstadt, 1960.

_____. Kyrios Christos. 5th edition. Göttingen, 1965.

Brandenburger, Egon. Adam und Christus. (WMANT, 7.)
Neukirchen, 1962.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Karl Barth, 'Die Auferstehung der
Toten,'" in Glauben und Verstehen (Tübingen, 1933),
pp. 38-64.

_____. Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die
kynisch-stoische Diatribe. (FRLANT, 13.) Göttingen,
1910.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Trans. K.
Grobstein. 2 vols. New York, 1951-55.

Clavier, H. "Brèves remarques sur la notion de $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$
 $\pi\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$," in W. D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.),
The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology.
Cambridge, 1954. Pp. 342-362.

Conzelmann, Hans. "Paulus und die Weisheit," NTS 12 (1965/66), 231-244.

F. L. Cross (ed. and trans.). The Jung Codex. London, 1955.

Cumont, Franz. Lux Perpetua. Paris, 1949.

Dahl, Nils. "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (BZNW 21, Berlin, 1954), 3-9.

_____. "Paulus apostel og menigheten i Korinth (1 Kor. 1-4)," NTT 54 (1953), 1-23.

Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London, 1962.

Dibelius, Martin. Der Brief des Jakobus. 10th edition. Meyer. Göttingen, 1959.

_____. Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus. Göttingen, 1909.

Dodds, E. R. Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety. Cambridge, 1965.

_____. Proclus: The Elements of Theology. 2nd edition. Oxford, 1963.

Dörrie, Heinrich. "Emanation. Ein unphilosophisches Wort im spätantiken Denken," in K. Flasch (ed.), Parusia. Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus (Frankfurt, 1965), pp. 119-141.

Doresse, Jean. The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. Trans. P. Mairé. New York, 1960.

Drower, E. S. The Secret Adam. A Study of Naṣoraeen Gnosis. Oxford, 1960.

Du Plessis, P. J. ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament. Kampen, 1959.

- Dupont, Jacques. Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les epitres de saint Paul. 2nd edition. (Universitatis Catholicae Lovaniensis Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica. Ser. II, 40.) Louvain, 1960.
- Einsenhenger, J. A. Entdecktes Judentum. Vol. 1. 1700.
- Fascher, Erich. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. Giessen, 1927.
- Feine, Paul, Johannes Behm, and Werner G. Kümmel. Introduction to the New Testament. Trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. Nashville, 1966.
- Feuillet, Andre. "Les 'Chefs de ce siècle' et la Sagesse divine d'après 1 Cor. 2,6-8," in SPIC 1 (Rome, 1963), 383-393.
- Flasser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (Jerusalem, 1958), 215-266.
- Foerster, Werner. Von Valentin zu Herakleon. Giessen, 1928.
- Ford, J. M. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews?" CBQ 28 (1966), 402-416.
- Frid, Bo. "Diskussionen om gnosticisms uppkomst," STT 43 (1967), 169-185.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. "Gnosis. Et Bidrag til Belysning av den Paulinske Terminologi og Erkjennelsesteori," in Religionshistoriska Studier tillägnade Edvard Lehmann. Lund, 1927. Pp. 85-109.
- Funk, Robert W. Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God. New York, 1966.
- Georgi, Dieter. Die Gegner des Paulus im 2 Korintherbrief. (WMANT, 11.) Neukirchen, 1964.
- _____. Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem. (ThF, 38.) Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965.

Georgi, Dieter. "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2,6-11," in E. Dinkler (ed.), Zeit und Geschichte. Tübingen, 1964. Pp. 263-293.

_____. W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth, a review, Verkündigung und Forschung (Bericht 1958/59), pp. 90-96.

Giversen, Søren. "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis," StTh 17 (1963), 60-76.

_____. "Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1963," StTh 17 (1963), 139-187.

Grant, R. M. After the New Testament. Philadelphia, 1967.

_____. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. Rev. edition. New York, 1966.

_____. "The Wisdom of the Corinthians," in Sherman Johnson (ed.), The Joy of Study. New York, 1951. Pp. 51-55.

Guthrie, W. K. C. The Greeks and Their Gods. Boston, 1961.

Haardt, Robert. "Zwanzig Jahre Erforschung der koptisch-gnostische Schriften von Nag Hammadi," ThPh 42 (1967), 390-401.

Haenchen, Ernst. "Das Buch Baruch," ZTK 50 (1953), 123-158.

_____. "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" ZTK 49 (1952), 316-349.

Harnack, Adolf von. Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Darmstadt, 1960. (Reprint of 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1924.)

Hegermann, Harald. Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum. (TU 82.) Berlin, 1961.

Héring, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Trans. A. Heathcote and P. Allcock. London, 1962.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums. Darmstadt, 1963. (First published in 1884: Leipzig.)

Jeremias, Joachim. "Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," in Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie. Göttingen, 1966. Pp. 151-159.

Jervell, Jacob. Imago Dei. (FRLANT, 58.) Göttingen, 1960.

Jonas, Hans. "Delimitation of the gnostic phenomenon--typological and historical," in U. Bianchi (ed.), Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966 (Studies in the History of Religions, Supplements to Numen 12.) Leiden, 1967. Pp. 90-108.

_____. "Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation," in F. L. Cross (ed.), Studia Patristica, vol. 6. (TU 81.) Berlin, 1962. Pp. 96-111.

_____. Gnosis und spätantiker Geist. Vol. 1, 3rd edition. (FRLANT 51.) Göttingen, 1964.

_____. The Gnostic Religion. Boston, 1963.

_____. "Response to G. Quispel's 'Gnosticism and the New Testament,'" in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Nashville, 1965. Pp. 279-293.

Käsemann, Ernst. "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," in Essays on New Testament Themes. (SBT 41.) London, 1964. Pp. 136-148.

Knox, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge, 1939.

Koester, Helmut. "Paul and Hellenism," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Nashville, 1965. Pp. 187-195.

_____. U. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, a review, Gnomon 33 (1961), 590-595.

Kragerud, Alv. "Apocryphon Johannis. En formanalyse," NTT 66 (1965), 15-38.

- Krause, Martin. "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesus Christi, in Mullis (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband, 1, Münster, 1964), 215-223.
- Laffranque, Marie. Posidonios d'Apamée. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Paris. Serie "Recherches," 13.) Paris, 1964.
- Leisegang, Hans. Der heilige Geist. Vol. 1. Leipzig, 1919.
- Lewy, Hans. Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Cairo, 1956.
- Licht, Jacob. "An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD," in Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (Jerusalem, 1958), 88-99.
- Liechtenhan, Rudolf. Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus. Göttingen, 1901.
- Lietzmann, Hans, and W. G. Kümmel. An die Korinther I.II. 4th edition. (HNT, 9.) Tübingen, 1949.
- Luck, Ulrich. "Weisheit und Leiden. Zum Problem Paulus und Jakobus," ThLZ 92 (1967), 253-258.
- Lütgert, W. Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth. (BFCT, 12.3.) Gütersloh, 1908.
- Luhrmann, Dieter. Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden. (WMANT, 16.) Neukirchen, 1965.
- MacRae, George. "Gnosis in Messina," CBQ 28 (1966), 322-333.
- _____. "Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature." 2 vols. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1966.
- Maly, Karl. "1 Kor 12,1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?" BZ 10 (1966), 82-95.

Mauser, Ulrich. "Galater III.20: die Universalität des Heils," NTS 13 (1966/67), 258-269.

Meyer, Rudolf. Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie. Stuttgart, 1937.

Moule, C. F. D. "St. Paul and Dualism," NTS 12 (1965/66), 106-123.

Munck, Johannes. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. Trans. F. Clarke. Richmond, Va., 1959.

Neufeld, V. H. The Earliest Christian Confessions. (New Testament Tools and Studies, 5.) Grand Rapids, 1963.

Nilsson, Martin P. Geschichte der griechischen Religion. Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Munich, 1961.

_____. "The New Conception of the Universe in Late Greek Paganism," Eranos 44 (1946), 20-27.

Nock, Arthur Darby. Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background. New York, 1964.

_____. R. Reitzenstein and H. H. Schaeder. Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland. A review. JHS 49 (1929), 111-116.

Pearson, Birger A. "Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?" JBL 86 (1967), 301-305.

Petersen, Norman R. "The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1967.

Peterson, Erik. "Die Befreiung Adams aus der 'Ανάγκη," in Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Freiburg, 1959. Pp. 107-128.

_____. ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ. (FRLANT 41.) Göttingen, 1926.

_____. "1 Kor. 1.18f. und die Thematik des jüdischen Busstages," in Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Freiburg, 1959. Pp. 43-50.

Philonenko, Marc. "Quod oculus non vidit, 1 Cor. 2,9."
ThZ 14 (1958), 51-52.

Pohlenz, Max. Die Stoa. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Göttingen, 1959.

Preuschen, E. "Die apocryphen gnostischen Adamschriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht," in W. Diehl (ed.), Festgruss Bernhard Stade. Giessen, 1900. Pp. 163-252.

Prigent, P. "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor 2,9,"
ThZ 14 (1958), 416-429.

Pryke, J. "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," RevQum 19,5 (1965), 345-360.

Pulver, Max. "The Experience of the Pneuma in Philo," in Spirit and Nature (Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks, vol. 1, ed. J. Campbell.) New York, 1954. Pp. 107-121.

Quispel, G. "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose Valentinienne," in Eranos-Jahrbuch 15 (1947), 249-286.

_____. "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," in Eranos-Jahrbuch 22 (1953), 195-234.

_____. "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," VigChr 1 (1947), 43-73.

Reitzenstein, R. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. 3rd edition. Stuttgart, 1927.

_____. Poimandres. Darmstadt, 1966. (First published in 1904: Leipzig.)

_____, and H. Schaeder. Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 7.) Leipzig, 1926.

Resch, Alfred. Agrapha. (TU 5.4.) Leipzig, 1889.

Reumann, J. "Οἰκονομία-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte," NTS 13 (1967), 147-167.

Ringgren, Helmer.. Word and Wisdom. Lund, 1947.

Robinson, J. M. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament,"
in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), The Bible in Modern Scholarship.
Nashville, 1965. Pp. 114-150.

_____. "Λόγοι Σοφῶν. Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q,"
in E. Dinkler (ed.), Zeit und Geschichte. Tübingen,
1964. Pp. 77-96.

Rudolph, Kurt. "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-
Spekulation," ZRGG 9 (1957), 1-20.

_____. Die Mandäer. Vol. 1: Prolegomena: Das
Mandäerproblem. Göttingen, 1960.

_____. Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den
mandäischen Schriften. (FRLANT, 88.) Göttingen, 1965.

Sagnard, François. La gnose Valentinienne et le Témoignage
de saint Irénée. (Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale, 36.)
Paris, 1947.

Schenke, H.-M. Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis.
Göttingen, 1962.

_____. "Die Spitze des dem Apokryphen Johannis und der
Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen
Systems," ZRGG 14 (1962), 352-361.

Schlier, Heinrich. "Das Denken der frühchristlichen
Gnosis," in W. Eltester (ed.), Neutestamentliche
Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (BZNW 21.) Berlin, 1954.
Pp. 67-82.

Schmithals, Walter. Die Gnosis in Korinth. (FRLANT 66.)
2nd edition. Göttingen, 1965.

_____. Paulus und die Gnostiker. (ThF 35.) Hamburg-
Bergstedt, 1965.

Schneider, B. V. "The Corporate Meaning and Background
of 1 Cor. 15.45b," CBQ 29 (1967), 450-467.

Scholem, Gershom. "Die Vorstellung vom Golem in ihren tellurischen und magischen Beziehungen," in Eranos-Jahrbuch 22 (1953), 235-289.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Trans. W. Montgomery. London, 1931.

Scroggs, Robin. The Last Adam. A Study in Pauline Anthropology. Philadelphia, 1966.

_____. "Paul: Σοφός and Πνευματικός," NTS 14 (1967), 33-55.

Segelberg, Eric. Mašbuta. Studies in the Ritual of the Mandaean Baptism. Uppsala, 1958.

Sjöberg, Erik. Der verborgene Menschensohn in der Evangelien. (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, 53.) Lund, 1955.

Smyth, Kevin. "Heavenly Man and Son of Man in St. Paul," in SPCIC, vol. 1 (Rome, 1963), 219-230.

Strack, Hermann, and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. Vol. 3. München, 1954.

Sweet, J. P. M. "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia," NTS 13 (1966/67), 240-257.

van Unnik, W. C. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings. (SBT 30.) London, 1960.

Wagner, Günter. Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem von Römer 6, 1-11. (ATANT, 39.) Zürich, 1962.

Walter, Nikolaus. Der Thorausleger Aristobulos. (TU 86.) Berlin, 1964.

Wegenast, Klaus. Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen. (WMANT, 8.) Neukirchen, 1962.

Weiss, Johannes. Der erste Korintherbrief. Meyer. 9th edition. Göttingen, 1910.

Werner, Eric. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis," in Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume. Vol. 2. Jerusalem, 1965. Pp. 793-818.

Wetstein, John J. Novum Testamentum Graecum. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1751-52.

Wilckens, Ulrich. Weisheit und Torheit. (BHT, 26.) Tübingen, 1959.

Wiles, M. F. The Divine Apostle. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church. Cambridge, 1967.

Wolfson, Harry A. "Immortality and Resurrection in the Philosophy of the Church Fathers," in K. Stendahl (ed.), Immortality and Resurrection. New York, 1965. Pp. 54-96.

_____. Philo. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1947.

Zandee, J. The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, Mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex. (Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul, 11.) Istanbul, 1961.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This thesis is the property of Harvard University. In order to protect the literary rights of the author, the University reserves exclusive rights to reproduce its theses. Theses supplied on loan are for reading and consultation purposes only; further reproduction by any process is expressly forbidden.

Microfilm or other copies may not be recopied, sold or given away to another individual, firm, or library, without written permission from the University.

A reader may not quote or closely paraphrase the contents of this thesis in his own work without the author's written permission. Author's address will be supplied, insofar as possible, by the Harvard University Archives. If this thesis benefits the reader's research in any way, he must acknowledge such benefits in his own work.

All inquiries regarding the use of, and restrictions on, this thesis should be addressed to:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS